

First Indian Edition, 1938
New Edition, 3000 Copies, July, 1949
Rupees Two and a half

Printed and Published by Jivanji Dahyabha
Navajivan Press, Kalupur, Ahmedabad

THE POWER OF NON-VIOLENCE


BY
RICHARD B. GREGG

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY
RUFUS M. JONES, LL. D.
EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY
HAVERFORD COLLEGE



NAVAJIVAN PUBLISHING HOUSE
AHMEDABAD

TO
MOHANDAS KARAMCHAND GA



INTRODUCTION TO FIRST EDITION

Here is a new kind of book. The title might give the impression that this is another book by a dreamer of dreams, that once more the idealist has projected his iridescent rainbow, which will always be put in the sky and never touch the earth at any point.

But the reader will soon discover that this book is not just another dream, or one more rainbow vision. There is as much realism in this book as there is idealism. It is a fine blend of *what is* and *what ought to be*. In any case, for this writer, *what ought to be* springs out of, and has its ground and basis in, *what is*. We are not invited to watch mental "projections" shot up like rockets. We are rather called upon to follow a careful dialectic process which shows an effective method of life demonstrating itself, proving its genuine worth and verifying itself in practice.

Nobody can read Chapter II of this book — "Moral Jiu-Jitsu" — or Chapter III — "What Happens" — without being convinced that he is not being rushed into a vague subjective idealism. These two chapters, to single out only two, gave me a compelling sense, as I read them in manuscript, that there was a clear thinking mind behind the pen that wrote them and that the book must go forth into print to do its work of leadership in the world. I rejoice to see it on its way, and I predict for it a far-reaching appreciative welcome.

Let me give one or two "exhibits" of the practical wisdom of the book: "As a method of solving a conflict, non-violent resistance is sounder than reciprocal violence because it is more efficient. The first reason for this is partly physiological. Anger, hatred and fear make an enormous drain upon our energy."

"The peaceful resister has to expend much energy, but he applies it more intelligently than does the violent man. He selects the really important forces in the environment and seeks to alter them. The angry and violent man puts too much emphasis on immediate objects and too little on the ultimate impelling forces behind them. If he considers impelling forces, he does not analyze them sufficiently or go far enough back. He has to waste much energy because, as it were, he uses too short leverages in attempting to move or divert opposing objects or forces. The non-violent resister, by using longer psychological leverages, may have to move more slowly sometimes, but the work is more efficiently done and tends to be more permanent."

"Peace imposed by violence is not psychological peace but a suppressed conflict. It is unstable for it contains the seeds of its own destruction. The outer condition is not a true reflection of the inner condition. But in peace secured by true non-violent resistance there is no longer any inner conflict but a new channel found in which both the formerly conflicting energies are at work in the same direction and in harmony. Here the outer condition reflects the inner condition. This is perhaps one reason why Gandhi calls this mode of solving conflicts "Satyagraha" — holding to truth. Such a peace is enduring."

These are only a few vivid snap-shots out of the compact wisdom of the book. The author has drawn upon almost every department of life to illustrate his thesis. In one chapter he is a historian, in another he is a psychologist, in another he takes us into the technique of the law-court, in another he shows the statesman confronted with the problems of international life. He is as much at home in one field as in another.

We expected him to draw upon the New Testament, especially upon the Sermon on the Mount, for texts on non-violence. And so he does. But the reader will soon discover that this is only one of the author's many effective

religious documents. He draws upon the literary sources of all the great religions of the world. This book has something to say to Hindus and Mahomedans and Buddhists and Jews as well as to Christians. He reinforces his argument from Tolstoy and St. Francis, from George Fox and Gandhi, but we are never left with sentiment and enthusiasms. The argument is buttressed with the insight and the wisdom of the men of the world's affairs and with the judgment of leading economists and sociologists as well as with the insights and inspiration of prophets and seers.

There is a remarkable story about Moses in ancient Hebrew legends. It tells how when Moses was going up the mountain to his death on Pisgah he asked Jehovah why it was not possible for him to be allowed to enter the Promised Land which he could see stretching out before his dying eyes. "You doubted me," Jehovah said to him, "but I forgave you that doubt." "You doubted your own self and failed to believe in your own powers as a leader, and I forgave that also. But you lost faith in this people and doubted the divine possibilities of human nature. *That* I cannot forgive. That loss of faith makes it impossible for you to enter the Land of Promise."

It is only a legend, but it suggests a profound truth. It is only those who believe in man and have faith and hope in the new and better world which man in co-operation with God can build here on earth that help to lead us toward the lands of promise. The author of this book has this deep-seated faith and he has effectively interpreted it.

Haverford,
Penna.

Rufus M. Jones

o
th
tio.
nat.
attit
of In

PREFACE TO NEW EDITION

There is a political maxim, almost an 'axiom, that you cannot permanently govern large numbers of people merely by violence or by deceit or both. Despite the events of the last decade, this maxim stands. Part of the converse of this maxim is a proposition whose truth is much less generally recognized, namely that in non-violence and truth there is power.

The struggle in India during 1930-33 and the subsequent and continuing impasse of the British Government in India prove that the method of non-violent resistance which Gandhi advocates and uses is potent. If, then, this method of dealing with conflicts has elements of practical validity, the vastly increasing perils of war and class conflict make it important for us to learn whatever may help to evolve peace.

Is non-violent resistance intellectually and morally respectable or not? If anywhere it is at all practical, to what extent, and why? Is it applicable in the West, or not? The subject of pacificism, in both individual and collective use, should be removed from the profitless atmosphere of emotional adjectives and of vague mysticism, futile protests and sentimentalism combined with confused thinking. Both the advocates and opponents of non-violent resistance need to understand it much more clearly and fully.

It is difficult for one trained in modern Western modes of thought and action to understand this idea or to believe that its practice can be cogent. Even Gandhi's explanations of it fail to carry weight with most of us. His explanations come out of a background of thought, feeling, and attitude to life very different from ours. The assumptions of Indians are different, and so are their social experience,

the elements of thought which are implicit but never definitely stated, their historical allusions, their analogies and figures of speech. Therefore I have felt it desirable to restate and explain this method in modern Western concepts and terminology. But the book is not a history of the Indian struggle for independence, or even of Gandhi's part in it.

I have tried to test the idea of non-violence with the recent findings of psychology, military and political strategy, political theory, economics, physiology, biology, ethics, penology, and education. Yet I have tried to be simple, to avoid technical jargon, and to keep the treatment fresh. I have tried to meet the critics of the idea fairly on their own ground.

I have, however, not limited the explanation merely to Gandhi's own concepts or to India, but have tried to explain and evaluate the principle in its application in any country, at any time, under any circumstances, and for any cause. I have attempted to show why persuasion of this sort is more powerful and more permanently advantageous than physical coercion.

If we want a better world, we must be prepared to do some careful thinking. It is time we stopped being sketchy on a matter which touches us all so closely. For in reality this matter of handling conflict constructively is of immediate concern to everyone who has ever been angry or afraid, resentful, revengeful, or bitter; who has ever taken part in a fight, mob-violence, or war; or who has been the object of anger, hatred, exploitation, or oppression. It touches all who are troubled lest the vast economic, political, and social questions which are pressing upon all nations will issue in still more appalling violence and increased insecurity for everyone. It is also important to those who hope that somehow the ideals and conduct of mankind can be harmonized, and the ideals made practical.

My qualifications for writing this book are experiences of conflict involved in my three years' practice of law and seven years in industrial relations work — investiga-

tion, conciliation, arbitration, publicity and statistical work for trade unions, followed by a stay in India of nearly four years beginning early in 1925, of which about seven months altogether were spent at Gandhi's own *ashrama* at Sabarmati, another six-weeks' visit to India in March and April, 1930, many discussions with Gandhi and a careful study of all that he has written, so far as I could find it ; also a study of much of the other literature of the entire subject of conflict and peace.

To all the profound, clear, and sensitive minds with which I have come in contact, in India and in other countries, in the past and the present, I owe a great obligation. To Gandhi especially I am grateful. For criticism and help I desire to thank especially my wife, W. Norman Brown, Caroline F. Tupper, Blanche Watson, John Nevin Sayre, Rufus M. Jones, my sister, Marjorie T. Gregg, and the late C. F. Andrews. I want also to thank all the authors and publishers who have kindly permitted me to quote from their books and articles.

The first edition of this book was published in 1935. It is now out of print. Subsequent events have raised many questions not considered in the first edition. The Second World War has created such confused thoughts and feelings, and raised problems which are so universal, so important, so difficult, and so insistent that it has seemed desirable to issue a new edition which will discuss the chief of these new problems and yet be less expensive and thus find a wider circle of readers.

To do this, I have cut from the first edition eight chapters with their notes and in place of them inserted three new chapters. The chapters which were eliminated had these titles : " The Class Struggle and Non-violent Resistance ", " Further Political Aspects ", " Biological Considerations ", " Doubts and Querries ", " Preparations for Non-violence ", " Further Understanding ", " Self-Discipline ", " Group Training and Discipline ". The three new chapters discuss " Persuasion ", " The Need for Discipline " and " Discipline ". I was especially regretful at having to drop

off the chapter on the class struggle. Though limitations of expense prevented bringing some of the historical matter up to date and broadening its scope, the conclusions originally derived have not been invalidated.

Putney, Vermont,
August, 1944

Richard B. Gregg

CONTENTS

	INTRODUCTION	Page v
	PREFACE	ix
Chapter		
I	MODERN EXAMPLES OF NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE	3
II	MORAL JIU-JITSU	21
III	WHAT HAPPENS	32
IV	UTILIZING EMOTIONAL ENERGY	43
V	HOW IS MASS NON-VIOLENCE POSSIBLE?	51
VI	THE WORKING OF MASS NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE	58
VII	AN EFFECTIVE SUBSTITUTE FOR WAR	80
VIII	NON-VIOLENCE AND THE STATE	91
IX	PERSUASION	102
X	THE NEED FOR TRAINING	135
XI	TRAINING	149
	NOTES BY CHAPTERS	157
	INDEX	181



THE POWER OF NON-VIOLENCE



CHAPTER I

MODERN EXAMPLES OF NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

There have been many instances of successful use of non-violent resistance in different countries and at different times. As the taste of historians inclines more toward politics and wars, these other events have received but slight attention at their hands, and the records of many of them have been lost. In some instances the non-violent resistance was by individuals, in other instances it took a mass or corporate form. The latter form is rarer and perhaps more significant. For this reason and because this book is not primarily a history, I will only attempt to tell of a few outstanding successful modern examples of the latter sort, giving references, however, to books in which cases of both kinds are described.

The first one to be considered occurred in Hungary during the mid-nineteenth century.¹ The Emperor Franz Josef was trying to subordinate Hungary to the Austrian power, contrary to the terms of the old treaty of union of those two countries. The Hungarian moderates felt helpless, as they were too weak to fight. But Francis Deak, a Catholic landowner of Hungary, protested to them—"Your laws are violated, yet your mouths remain closed! Woe to the nation which raises no protest when its rights are outraged! It contributes to its own slavery by its silence. The nation which submits to injustice and oppression without protest is doomed."

Deak proceeded to organize a scheme for independent Hungarian education, agriculture and industry, a refusal to recognize the Austrian Government in any way, and a boycott against Austrian goods. He admonished the people not to be betrayed into acts of violence, nor to

abandon the ground of legality. "This is the safe ground," he said, "on which, unarmed ourselves, we can hold our own against armed force.. If suffering must be necessary, suffer with dignity." This advice was obeyed throughout Hungary.

When the Austrian tax collector came the people did not beat him or even hoot him — they merely declined to pay. The Austrian police then seized their goods, but no Hungarian auctioneer would sell them. When an Austrian auctioneer was brought, he found that he would have to bring bidders from Austria to buy the goods. The Government soon discovered that it was costing more to dis-train the property than the tax was worth.

The Austrians attempted to billet their soldiers upon the Hungarians. The Hungarians did not actively resist the order, but the Austrian soldiers, after trying to live in houses where everyone despised them, protested strongly against it. The Austrian Government declared the boycott of Austrian goods illegal, but the Hungarians defied the decree. The jails were filled to overflowing. No representatives from Hungary would sit in the Imperial Parliament.

The Austrians then tried conciliation. The prisoners were released and partial self-government given. But Hungary insisted upon its full claims. In reply, Emperor Franz Josef decreed compulsory military service. The Hungarians answered that they would refuse to obey it. Finally, on February 18, 1867, the Emperor capitulated and gave Hungary her constitution.

This campaign seems to have been defective because of some violence of inner attitude on the part of the Hungarians. But even so, it provided a remarkable example of the power of non-violent resistance, even though the principle was imperfectly realized and applied.

The next example occurred in South Africa. It lasted eight years, beginning in 1906. For many years previously Indians had been coming to Natal as manual workers in the mines and elsewhere, originally at the invitation of the

Europeans who wished to develop the country. Many thousands of the Indians came as indentured labourers, whose term of service was five years. They were industrious, entered into farming and trade, and thereby began to compete with the Europeans. By 1906 some 12,500 of them had crossed the border and settled in the Transvaal. They were subject to many unfair laws. In 1906, the Government of the Transvaal introduced a bill in the legislature which would require every Indian to be registered by finger print, like criminals, and to produce his certificate of registration upon demand of any police officer at any time. Failure to register meant deportation, and refusal to produce the certificate would be punished by fine.

The Indians had always been subject to severe restrictions, but this proposal meant their complete subjection and probably their destruction as a community. Under the leadership of an Indian lawyer, M. K. Gandhi, they held meetings of protest and asked for hearings on the bill. But the Government ruthlessly passed it. Thereupon the leading Indians, at a huge mass meeting, took an oath that they would all refuse to register and would go to jail rather than obey the law which by its terms they regarded as an attack upon the very foundations of their religion, their national honour, their racial self-respect; and their manhood.

They stuck to their resolve and Gandhi and many others went to jail. The Prime Minister, General Smuts, then undertook to have the law repealed if the Indians would register voluntarily. The Indians agreed and did their part, but General Smuts did not carry out his side of the agreement. Not only that, but the Government introduced a further bill which applied the old registration law to all Asiatics who had not voluntarily registered. The Indians then resolved to renew the struggle.

Not long after that, in 1913, a European judge in the Transvaal Supreme Court made a court decision which invalidated all Hindu and Mohammedan marriages, and thus rendered all the Indian children illegitimate and

incapable of inheriting property. This roused all the Indian women. A group of them, at Gandhi's suggestion, crossed from the Transvaal to Natal, an act forbidden to them by law, and picketed the Natal mines which were worked by Indian labourers. The women were imprisoned. But the men, numbering about five thousand, all came out on strike as a protest against this court decision about marriages and against a very heavy and oppressive head-tax which practically kept them in slavery. Under Gandhi's leadership they started a march on foot across the border into the Transvaal, by way of a non-violent protest. It was against the law for Indians to cross the boundary line in either direction without permission.

Gandhi notified the Government of this proposal and asked for a revocation of the law, several days before the march, and again just before it started, but to no effect.

They marched, some four thousand strong, about twenty-five miles a day, living on the charity of Indian merchants. During the march Gandhi was arrested three times, released on bail twice, and finally put in jail. The border was crossed and the army continued, leaderless, but still non-violent. Finally they were all arrested and taken back by train to Natal. They had accomplished their object, — namely to be put in jail and to make an effective protest.

They were impounded at the mines and beaten and ill-treated. Still they remained firm and non-violent. This brutal affair aroused a tremendous storm of public opinion both in South Africa and India. Lord Hardinge, the Viceroy of India, in a public speech at Madras, praised and defended the conduct of the non-violent resisters and protested against the acts of the Union of South Africa. Two Englishmen, Messrs. C. F. Andrews and W. W. Pearson, went from India at the request of the Indian public. Later on, the Viceroy sent Sir Benjamin Robertson to represent the Government of India. But the negotiations with the protesting Indians remained entirely in Gandhi's hands.

General Smuts, seeing that he must retreat, appointed a committee of investigation to save the face of the Government, and at the same time released Gandhi and two other leaders of the Indians. The Indians requested Indian representation on the committee of inquiry as surety of good faith. General Smuts refused, so Gandhi prepared to renew the struggle.

Just then a strike broke out among the European railwaymen in South Africa. Gandhi saw that the Government was in a very difficult situation, but instead of taking advantage of the incident, he chivalrously suspended the Indian struggle until the railway strike was over, an act which won much admiration for the Indians.

After the railway strike was over, General Smuts found it necessary to yield, and the Indians won all the major parts of their demands, namely the abolition of the registration, the abolition of the three-pound head-tax, the validation of their marriages, the right of entry of educated Indians, and an assurance of just administration of existing laws. Thus the whole struggle was won by non-violent resistance.²

Another application of this principle was in behalf of the indigo peasant farmers of Champaran, a district of Bihar, in northern India, in 1917. The peasants there were compelled by law to plant three-twentieths of all their land in indigo and also were subject to other oppressive exactions by the planters. Gandhi, who had returned to live in India in 1914, was invited to investigate the conditions of the workers on the indigo plantations and the treatment given them by their employers. He began his inquiry without publicity but the planters much resented his activities there and persuaded the District Magistrate that the presence of Gandhi was dangerous to the peace of the district. The Magistrate served an order upon Gandhi to leave the district by the next available train. Gandhi replied that he had come there from a sense of duty, that nothing was being done except

carefully and quietly to ascertain facts, and that he would stay and, if necessary, submit to the penalty for disobedience.

He and his companions then proceeded quietly to take down in writing the statements of the peasants who came flocking to tell of their wrongs. The witnesses were questioned to elicit the exact truth. The Government sent police officers who were present at these proceedings and took notes of what happened. Gandhi and his assistants arranged that if he should be jailed or deported, two of them would go on with the taking of peasants' testimony; and if those two were arrested, then two more should take up the work, and so on.

Gandhi was summoned to court and tried. He simply pleaded guilty, and stated that he was faced with a conflict of duty — whether to obey the law or his conscience and the humane purposes for which he had come; and that under the circumstances he could only throw the responsibility of removing him upon the administration. The Magistrate postponed judgment, and before it was rendered the Lieutenant-Governor gave orders that Gandhi should be permitted to proceed with the investigation. Then the Governor of the province interested himself in the case and, after conferring with Gandhi, appointed a Government commission of inquiry with Gandhi as a member. The commission reported unanimously that the law was unfair and the exactions of the big planters unjust. The law was repealed and justice given to the peasants. All this was wholly non-violent.³ In purpose, the struggle was purely for economic justice, with no political implications.

Another non-violent struggle, this time for social rights, took place in a village called Vykom, in the State of Travancore in southern India. It was also directed by Gandhi, through some of his followers. A highway ran through the low-lying country around Vykom and through the village and close by the Brahman quarter and a temple. For centuries the Brahmans had refused to permit

any low-caste "untouchable" people to use this road. The followers of Gandhi decided that this custom must be ended, and the road thrown open to all human beings alike. Gandhi was ill, many hundred miles away, but the young leaders came north and consulted with him on the plan of campaign, and as it proceeded he instructed them by letters and telegrams from his sick bed. Later he visited Vykom personally.

The leaders started the struggle by taking several of the "untouchable" friends with them along this road and into the Brahman quarter. They were immediately beaten by the Brahmans, and one was seriously hurt. But the young reformers offered no violence in return. Then the police arrested several of these young men for encouraging trespass. They were condemned to prison for different periods of time, up to one year. At once, volunteers came pouring in from all parts of the country to take the place of those who were arrested. The State then forbade any further arrests but ordered the police to prevent any more of the reformers from entering the road. The police made a cordon across the road. Thereupon, by instructions from Gandhi, the reformers stood opposite the police barrier in an attitude of prayer. They organized themselves into shifts, taking turns in standing there for six hours at a time. They built a hut near by, undertook their duties on a religious basis and did hand spinning while not on active duty. At no time did they offer any violence.

This programme continued for months. Gandhi told them it must continue indefinitely until the hearts of the Brahmans should be melted. Finally the rainy season came and the road, being on low ground, was flooded. Still the volunteers continued to stand, at times up to their shoulders in water, while the police kept the cordon in small boats. The shifts had to be shortened to three hours.

All this time there was a furore of discussion of the matter all over India. The endurance and the consistent non-violence of the reformers was finally too much for the obstinacy of the Brahmans. In the autumn of 1925

after a year and four months they broke down saying, "We cannot any longer resist the prayers that have been made to us, and we are ready to receive the untouchables." The Brahmans opened the road to all comers and the low caste people were allowed to walk at any time past the temple and past the Brahman quarters.

This change of policy had reverberations all through India and aided in removing similar restrictions against "untouchables" in other parts of India, and in strengthening the cause of caste reform.⁴

Still another successful non-violent struggle for economic justice took place in 1921 up in the Himalayas, north of Simla, in a little district called Kotgarh, with a population of only a few thousand. This district is on the highway between India and Tibet. As the scenery is of surpassing beauty and grandeur and some good hunting ground is not far beyond, the road was frequented by hunters and Government officials on vacations.

For years there had been a custom known as Begar, whereby any Government official or European could demand from any village headman along the road the services of as many men as the traveller desired, at any time, for as long a period as he wanted, for carrying luggage or messages at an utterly inadequate wage. Also the people could be required to drive their cows to the dak bungalow (a sort of inn) and supply as much milk as the traveller desired, also at ridiculously low prices. Thus farmers, many more than were needed, could be haled away from ploughing, or sowing or harvesting their crops or any other pressing business, to suit the whims of any European who was on the road.

One of the local Indian leaders protested but he was immediately jailed and the villagers were threatened with talk of machine guns and the like. A Mr. S. E. Stokes, who was living on his estate in the district and operating an apple orchard, decided to organize the resistance against this injustice. He was in sympathy with Gandhi's

ideas and worked out the plan on non-violent lines. But Gandhi himself had no part in the struggle.

The district elected a small committee or "panchayat" to direct the movement, of which Stokes was a leading member. In every village in the district all the people took an oath by their village gods to obey the orders of the committee and not to negotiate with the Government in this matter except through the committee.

The committee wrote out a long and carefully worded statement of the situation and its injustices and sent it to the District Commissioner. They requested hearings, but no notice was taken of it by the Commissioner. Letters were written to all the responsible officials. Copies of all letters were retained by the committee. Still the Begar exactions continued. The committee then notified the Commissioner that if the exactions were not ended on a stated date the entire district would refuse all requests for service.

This brought action. The Commissioner came up from Simla and called a large meeting. He threatened and used every stratagem he could to cause division between the different villages and castes, so as to break down the authority of the committee. But every man who was asked a question declined to answer, except through the committee. Moreover they all refused to give food or any service to any Government official or European travelling on that section of the road.

In a few weeks the District Commissioner had acceded to every single demand of the villagers' committee, and had to post all along the road printed rules which strictly limited the amount of service that could be asked and specified the wages. The struggle lasted several months, without the least violence by the farmers, and the outcome was a complete success in the district.⁵

Another effective campaign of non-violent resistance took place in 1928 in Bardoli Taluka, a small district near Surat in Bombay Presidency, India. It was undertaken

by the peasant inhabitants numbering about 88,000, in order to correct an economic injustice.

Contrary to the advice of the Joint Parliamentary Committee appointed to consider the Government of India Bill, 1919, and contrary to a resolution of the Legislative Council of the Bombay Presidency in 1924, the Bombay Provincial Government in 1927 enhanced the rate of rural taxation very severely, nominally 22 per cent but in actual application in some instances over 60 per cent. The peasantry claimed that the investigation upon which the increase had been based was wholly inadequate, that the tax official's report was inaccurate and carelessly compiled, and that the increase was unwarranted and unjust. They asked the Governor to appoint an independent and impartial committee of inquiry to hold a thorough public investigation of all the evidence. The Government paid no attention to the request. Then, after giving due notice of their intentions, the peasants of the entire district refused to pay the tax. At the initiative and request of the local people the movement was led by Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel, with the inspiration and advice of Gandhi. Mr. Patel held several large conferences with representatives from more than half the villages and of every class and religious community. He questioned these representatives very closely to estimate their determination and strength, and the cohesion and staying power of each and every village of the entire district. He explained in full detail the history of the case, their legal rights and the justice of their demands. He described clearly and fully to the villagers the possibilities and terrors of Government power. He told them that the struggle might be prolonged indefinitely. He gave them several days to think it all over, to count the cost, and to discuss it amongst themselves. They returned to a still larger meeting and after further discussion resolved to enter upon the struggle.

For several years before there had been four or five social service centres in different parts of the district, headed by well-trained and disciplined workers. These

were the beginning of the organization. Sixteen "camps" were located at convenient places through the district, and about 250 volunteer leaders were placed in these camps. In addition, there were volunteers in each village. These volunteers were to collect the news and information about the struggle in each village and forward it promptly every day to the headquarters of the movement. The volunteers also kept careful watch of the movements of all Government officials and warned the people of their coming and intentions. A news bulletin was printed every day and distributed to every village. Eventually, 10,000 copies a day were distributed in the district and 4,000 to subscribers outside. Mr. Patel's speeches were also distributed in pamphlet form. For the first month the volunteers spent much time getting signatures to a printed pledge by which the signers promised to stick together under their leaders, to adhere to truth and to remain non-violent no matter what happened. Almost everyone signed the pledge. The women were organized as well as the men, and took just as active a part as the men.

Meanwhile, Mr. Patel had extensive correspondence with the Government, trying in every way to get the officials to see the justice and lawfulness of the peasants' claim and request, and to clarify the people's position. But the officials were adamant and the struggle began.

The Government did its best to compel the peasants to pay the tax. It tried flattery and bribery with some; fines, floggings and imprisonment of others. It tried to divide the communities against each other. The Government officers seized and sold goods of the peasantry. It caused much of the peasants' land to be forfeited, and sold over 1,400 acres of such land at auction. It brought in number of Pathans, Muslims of the North-West Frontier Province, who insulted and tried to terrorize the villagers who were mostly Hindus. There were but few waverers or weaklings. The oppression solidified the feeling of the people. The caste organizations were strengthened. A strong social boycott was maintained against all

Government representatives and anyone who purchased distrained goods or forfeited lands. But Mr. Patel insisted that this boycott must not interfere with the supply of physical necessities to such people.

The publicity all over the country was enormous, and the sympathy of Indians of all kinds was almost universally with the peasants. The matter was discussed very fully in the Provincial legislature, and several members of the legislature resigned in protest against the Government's stand. The matter was discussed even in Parliament in London.

Through it all, the peasants stood firm, yet non-violent. After five and a half months, the Government had to yield to practically every one of the demands. The Governor appointed a committee of inquiry, agreed to restore all the land which had been sold or forfeited, and reinstated the village officials who had resigned. When the committee of inquiry made its report, it "substantially justified" the original complaints of the peasants and recommended a tax increase less than that which had been assessed by the Government. I understand that the decision was put into effect.⁶

In India there have been other instances of the successful use of organized mass non-violent resistance, as in the Ahmedabad mill strike in 1917 and the struggles against the Government at Kheda in 1916-17, at Borsad in 1923, and at Nagpur in 1927. All of these were conducted or supervised by Gandhi. The Kheda and Borsad struggles were in regard to taxation, and the Nagpur struggle involved the right to parade with an Indian Nationalist flag.

The Akali Sikhs in the Punjab waged a non-violent struggle for a period of years beginning in 1922 in behalf of their rights to control certain temple properties, in which they were partly successful.⁷ Gandhi had no hand in this, except to give encouragement.

Besides these there was the all-India non-co-operation struggle of 1921-22 which was unsuccessful in its immediate objective and yet immensely successful in awakening that country with its population of 350,000,000 people to desire freedom and to work concretely for its attainment. It profoundly altered the entire political situation in India, and thereby in the British Empire.⁸ The story of that struggle and the still more momentous one in which India is now (1930-34) engaged would occupy more space than I can now command, even if we had the complete information and the historical perspective to describe it adequately.⁹ Nevertheless, in order to provide a further basis for understanding, I will quote from press dispatches about two incidents in the struggle of 1930.

The New York "Telegram" carried a long dispatch from Mr. Webb Miller, special correspondent for the United Press. I quote only a part.

"Dharasana Camp, Surat District, Bombay Presidency, May 22 (by mail) — Amazing scenes were witnessed yesterday when more than 2,500 Gandhi 'volunteers' advanced against the salt pans here in defiance of police regulations.

"The official government version of the raid, issued today, stated that 'from Congress sources it is estimated 170 sustained injuries, but only three or four were seriously hurt.'

"About noon yesterday I visited the temporary hospital in the Congress camp and counted more than 200 injured lying in rows on the ground. I verified by personal observation that they were suffering injuries. Today even the British owned newspapers give the total number at 320....

"The scene at Dharasana during the raid was astonishing and baffling to the Western mind accustomed to see violence met by violence, to expect a blow to be returned and a fight result. During the morning I saw and heard hundreds of blows inflicted by the police, but saw not a single blow returned by the volunteers. So far as I could observe the volunteers implicitly obeyed Gandhi's creed of non-violence. In no case did I see a volunteer even raise an arm to deflect the blows from lathis. There were no outcries from the beaten Swarajists, only groans after they had submitted to their beating.

"Obviously it was the purpose of the volunteers to force the police to beat them. The police were placed in a difficult position

by the refusal to disperse and the action of volunteers in continually pressing closer to the salt pans.

"Many times I saw the police vainly threaten the advancing volunteers with upraised lathis. Upon their determined refusal to recede the lathis would fall upon the unresisting body, the volunteer would fall back bleeding or bruised and be carried away on a stretcher. Waiting volunteers, on the outskirts of the pans, often rushed and congratulated the beaten volunteer as he was carried off the field. It was apparent that most of the injured gloried in their injuries. One leader was heard to say, 'These men have done a great work for India today. They are martyrs to the cause.'

"Much of the time the stolid native Surat police seemed reluctant to strike. It was noticeable that when the officers were occupied on other parts of the line the police slackened, only to resume threatening and beating when the officers appeared again. I saw many instances of the volunteers pleading with the police to join them.

"At other times the police became angered, whereupon the beating would be done earnestly. During several of these incidents I saw the native police deliberately kick lying or sitting volunteers who refused to disperse. And I saw several instances where the police viciously jabbed sitting volunteers in the abdomen with the butt end of their lathi....

"Once I saw a native policeman in anger strike a half-submerged volunteer who had already been struck down into a ditch and was clinging to the edge of the bank. This incident caused great excitement among the volunteers who witnessed it.

"My reaction to the scenes was of revulsion akin to the emotion one feels when seeing a dumb animal beaten — partly anger, partly humiliation. It was to the description of these reactions that the Bombay censorship authorities objected among other things.

"In fairness to the authorities it must be emphasized that the Congress volunteers were breaking laws or attempting to break them, and that they repeatedly refused to disperse and attempted to pull down the entanglements with ropes, and that the volunteers seemed to glory in their injuries.

"In eighteen years of reporting in twenty-two countries, during which I have witnessed innumerable civil disturbances, riots, street fights and rebellions, I have never witnessed such harrowing scenes as at Dharasana. The Western mind can grasp violence returned by violence, can understand a fight, but is, I found, perplexed and baffled by the sight of men advancing coldly and deliberately and submitting to beating without

attempting defence. Some times the scenes were so painful that I had to turn away momentarily.

"One surprising feature was the discipline of the volunteers. It seemed they were thoroughly imbued with the Gandhi's non-violence creed, and the leaders constantly stood in front of the ranks imploring them to remember that Gandhi's soul was with them."

The Chicago "Daily News" published the following account from Mr. Negley Farson, its special correspondent in India :

"Bombay, June 21.—Heroic, bearded Sikhs, several with blood dripping from their mouths, refusing to move or even to draw their 'kirpans' (sacred swords) to defend themselves from the shower of lathi blows—

"Hindu women and girls dressed in orange robes of sacrifice, flinging themselves on the bridles of horses and imploring mounted police not to strike male Congress volunteers, as they were Hindus themselves—

"Stretcher bearers waiting beside little islands of prostrate unflinching, immovable Satyagrahis, who had flung themselves on the ground grouped about their women upholding the flag of Swaraj—

"These were the scenes on the Maidan Esplanade, Bombay's splendid sea-front park, where the six-day deadlock between police and Mahatma Gandhi's followers has broken out in a bewildering brutal and stupid yet heroic spectacle.

"The scene opened at six o'clock outside the Esplanade. At the police station facing the park some hundreds of yellow turbaned blue-clad, bare-legged Mahratti policemen were leaning on their dreaded bamboo lathis under the command of a score of English police sergeants in topees and cotton drill.

"At 6-45, marching in good formation down the tree-lined pleasant boulevard, came the first detachment of volunteers. This was the ambulance unit, mostly boys and young doctors, dressed in khaki with Red Cross badges on their arms. They marched past the waiting police without a glance to the south side of the playing field, where they parked their ambulances and brought out their stretchers.

"It was like nurses and orderlies preparing an operating theatre.

"At 7 o'clock began to come processions of white-robed volunteers bearing red, green and white banners, singing 'We will take Swaraj—India Our Motherland.' At the head of each walked a tiny detachment of women and girls dressed in orange

robes, many garlanded with jasmine. They marched steadily on past the policemen and actually lined up behind the stretchers.

"They waited there in a long front down the boulevard for the order to march on the field.

"I shall not forget the scenes which followed. Darkfaced Mahratti policemen in their yellow turbans marched along in column led by English sergeants across the field toward the waiting crowd. As they neared it the police went faster and faster. The Hindus, who may be willing to die but dread physical pain, watched them approach with frightened eyes. Then the police broke into a charge.

"Many Hindus at once ran, fleeing down the streets—but most stood stock still.

"Crash! Whack! Whack! Whack! At last the crowd broke. Only the orange clad women were left standing beside the prostrate figures of crumpled men. Congress volunteer ambulances clanging bells, stretcher bearers running helter-skelter across the field. Whack! Whack! Whack!

"A minute's lull and then, with flags flying another column of volunteers marched on to the vast green field. A column of Mahrattas marched to meet them. They clashed—a clash, a rattle, dull thuds, then the faint-hearted ran and again there was the spectacle of the green field dotted with a line of fallen bodies and again the same islands of orange clad Hindu women holding up the flags of Swaraj.

"And here in the center of one of these islands sat a little knot of men, their heads bowed, submitting to a rain of lathi blows—refusing to move until on a stretcher and completely laid out. And there were stretchers within two feet of the suffering men, waiting for them.

"Then came a band of fifty Sikhs—and a heroic scene. The Sikhs, as you know, are a fierce fighting brotherhood. As soon as he can raise one, every man wears a beard which he curls around a cord or ties to his ears. The Sikhs also wear their hair long like women and curl it in a topknot under their turbans. These Sikhs were Akalis of a fanatic religious sect. They wore the kirpan, or sacred sword.

"With them were fifteen of their young girls and women. The women also wore sacred swords, and although dressed in orange saris like Hindu women, they wore little cotton trousers which reached to their tiny, sandaled feet. They were pretty girls and not so loud voiced and excited as the Hindu ladies. They simply smiled—as if they liked danger—which they do.

"One of them had her little baby, which she wanted to hold

up before the police to dare them to come on. She laughed at me when my remark was translated that it was terrible to drag a child into this.

"Coming from all districts as representatives of the fighting Punjab, these Sikhs swore they would not draw their kirpans to defend themselves, but they would not leave the field. They did not.

"'Never, never, never!' they cried, to the terrific delight of their Hindu brothers, in Swaraj. 'We will never retreat. We will die, we will!' The police hesitated before hitting the Sikhs. They asked their women would they not please, please, leave the field.

"'No!' said the women, 'we will die with our men.'

"Mounted Indian policemen who had been galloping across the field, whacking heads indiscriminately, came to a stymie when they faced the little cluster of blue Akali turbans on the slender Sikh men.

"'The Sikhs are brave men—how can we hit them?' It was not fear, but respect.

"But the police, determined to try to clear the field, at last rushed around the Sikh women and began to hit the men. I stood within five feet of a Sikh leader as he took the lathi blows. He was a short, heavily muscled man.

"The blows came—he stood straight. His turban was knocked off. The long black hair was bared with the round topknot. He closed his eyes as the blows fell—until at last he swayed and fell to the ground.

"No other Sikhs had tried to shield him, but now, shouting their defiance, they wiped away the blood streaming from his mouth. Hysterical Hindus rushed to him, bearing cakes of ice to rub the contusions over his eyes. The Sikh gave me a smile—and stood for more.

"And then the police threw up their hands. 'You can't go on hitting a blighter when he stands up to you like that.'"

In addition to the foregoing examples, we have witnessed in China immensely effective economic boycotts against foreign goods. These were predominantly non-violent in outward form, but to outsiders, at least, the principle of non-violence seemed to be not so much a matter of conscious choice as of social habit. Chinese histories also tell us that the Chinese people have often used non-violent resistance toward their own rulers. The Jews have also been non-violent for the last 1900 years.

The principle of non-violent resistance had already been conceived and applied independently by numerous seers and courageous people in many different countries. Among them were Lao Tsu, Confucius, Buddha, the Jain Tirthankaras, Jesus Christ, St. Francis of Assisi, George Fox, Leo Tolstoi and many others too numerous to mention. But Gandhī is the outstanding person in modern times who has worked out the theory and applied it to mass movements in organized corporate fashion, and proved the validity of this extension by actual successful campaigns in numerous difficult situations.

Is non-violent resistance only for use by intellectuals, saints or ascetics? Is it adapted only to Oriental psychology and modes of thinking, feeling, acting and living? Not at all. Its record shows successful use by illiterate peasants and city-bred intellectuals, by saints and the ordinary run of mankind; rich men and poor, property owners and homeless vagabonds, by meat eaters and vegetarians, Europeans, Americans, Negroes, Chinese, Japanese and Indians, by the religiously minded and those not so accounted. It has been used successfully in political, economic, and social conflicts. It has been used by individuals and by groups, both large and small.¹⁰

Knowing that non-violent resistance has actually been used with success, at least in certain instances, let us now try to understand how and why it works.

CHAPTER II

MORAL JIU-JITSU

Most people hitherto have been sceptical of non-violent resistance simply because they could not understand how it could possibly work. They might be less sceptical if they could once see how the method could operate and be effective. Let us then try to understand first how non-violent resistance works. Later we may estimate the probabilities of its success in general use. Modern psychology enables us to understand the emotional, mental and moral mechanisms involved. So let us analyse the matter and pay attention to one part of the problem at a time. We will consider first its operation by individuals and later its use by organized groups of people.

If one man attacks another with physical violence and the victim hits back, the violent response gives the attacker a certain reassurance and moral support. It shows that the victim's scale of moral values in regard to violence as a mode of settling questions is the same as that of the attacker. A mere display of either fear or anger by the victim is sufficient to have this effect. It makes the attacker sure of his own *savoir-faire*, of his choice of methods, of his knowledge of human nature and hence of his opponent. He can rely on the victim's reacting in a definite way. The attacker's morale is sustained, his sense of values is vindicated. His confidence in his general method of dealing with his opponent is reassured.

But suppose the assailant attacks with physical violence a different sort of person. The attitude of this new opponent is fearless, calm, steady, and because of a different belief, training or experience he has much self-control. He does not respond to the attacker's violence with counter-violence. Instead, he accepts the blows with good-tempered reasoning, stating his belief as to the truth of the matter in dispute, asking for an examination of both

sides of the dispute, and stating his readiness to abide by the truth. He offers resistance, but only in moral terms. He states his readiness to prove his sincerity by his own suffering rather than by imposing suffering on the assailant, through violence. He accepts blow after blow, showing no signs of fear or shrinking or resentment, keeping steadily good humoured and kindly in look of eye, tone of voice, and posture of body and arms. To violence he opposes non-violent resistance.

The assailant's first thought may be that the opponent is afraid of him, is a coward, ready to give way and acknowledge defeat. But the opponent's look and posture show not fear but courage. His steady resistance of will reveals no subservience. His unflinching endurance of pain is startling.¹

At such an unusual and unexpected reaction the assailant will be surprised. If at first he was inclined to be scornful or contemptuous of the victim as a coward, those feelings rapidly become displaced by curiosity and wonder. As the psychologist Shand points out, "Wonder tends to exclude Repugnance, Disgust and Contempt in relation to its object."²

Thus non-violent resistance acts as a sort of moral jiu-jitsu. The non-violence and good will of the victim act like the lack of physical opposition by the user of physical jiu-jitsu, to cause the attacker to lose his moral balance. He suddenly and unexpectedly loses the moral support which the usual violent resistance of most victims would render him. He plunges forward, as it were, into a new world of values. He feels insecure because of the novelty of the situation and his ignorance of how to handle it. He loses his poise and self-confidence. The victim not only lets the attacker come, but, as it were, pulls him forward by kindness, generosity and voluntary suffering, so that the attacker quite loses his moral balance. The user of non-violent resistance, knowing what he is doing and having a more creative purpose and perhaps a clearer sense of ultimate values than the other, retains his moral

balance. He uses the leverage of a superior wisdom to subdue the rough direct force or physical strength of his opponent.³

Another way to state it is that between two persons in physically violent combat there may appear to be complete disagreement, but in reality they conduct their fight on the basis of a strong fundamental agreement that violence is a sound mode of procedure. Hence if one of the parties eliminates that basic agreement and announces by his actions that he has abandoned the method used generally by his forefathers back almost to the beginning of animal life, — no wonder that the other is startled and uncertain. His animal instincts no longer tell him instantly what to do. He feels that he has plunged into a new world. Here is something as new, apparently, as an airplane to an Eskimo.

Just as in the case of wrestling jiu-jitsu, the violence itself helps to overthrow its user. There are several reasons for this, in addition to the element of surprise.

The first is that prolonged anger is very exhausting. Undoubtedly anger at first gives an access of muscular and sometimes mental energy.⁴ But it also consumes energy very rapidly, and if long sustained it may completely exhaust the person feeling it.⁵

Secondly, part of the energy of the violent assailant is reverted and used up against himself. The steadfast appeals of an individual non-violent resister work in the personality of the violent attacker, arousing the latter's more decent and kindly motives and putting them in conflict with his fighting, aggressive instincts. Thus the attacker's personality is divided. The appeals, like commercial advertising, may require considerable repetition before they are effective, but the result is pretty sure. They act on the psychological principle of "summation of stimuli." ⁶

The violent assailant realizes that he made a mistake at first in thinking that his opponent was a coward. He is bothered by the thought that he may have made or

to control the process. Thirdly, his self-control and lack of anger conserves his energy. Moreover, he is not in as suggestible a condition as the violent assailant.

He has still another element of superior power,—his proved sincerity and conviction. Deep conviction is a great power. Some writer has said, "To be willing to suffer and die for a cause is an incontestible proof of sincere belief, and perhaps in most cases the only incontestible proof." Non-violence coupled with such suffering is still further proof of sincerity. Voluntary suffering is probably also a sure sign that the whole being of the sufferer,—body, mind, will and spirit, is integrated and at work with single purpose. This means that immense and unpredictable resources of energy are in action and ready to endure. The sight and realization of this is profoundly impressive and moving.

Again, the refusal of the victim to use violence is a strong indication of his respect for the personality and moral integrity of the assailant. From childhood we all tend to like people who show respect for our personality. This tendency operates even between the parties to a conflict. Such respect for the personality of the opponent was one of the important elements in the practice of mediaeval European chivalry, and added much to the charm and power of that code. Respect for personality is a prerequisite for real freedom and fine human association. It is proof of unselfishness and of moral poise and understanding. If, as at least two distinguished psychologists believe,^{10a} the self-regarding sentiment is the foundation of all the higher morality, a demonstration of respect for personality exercises a much deeper and more far-reaching influence than is generally realized. This respect gradually tends to put the violent attacker to shame and to enhance the respect of any onlookers toward the gentle resister.

Both opponents feel a desire and need for the approbation of others. Social approval and opprobrium are very strong forces. They act through and are a part of

the herd or gregarious instinct which is so powerful in mankind.¹¹ The tremendous pressure of social approval or dislike is well brought out in W. Trotter's "Instinct of the Herd in Peace and War."¹² Competent observers have stated that fear of social disapproval was the strongest of all the motives to enlistment in the armies in the World War.¹³ The desire for outside approval was strikingly shown by the great efforts devoted to propaganda by all the parties of the World War. Again, it is demonstrated in labour strikes and lockouts, in which both parties are at great pains to win public support and sympathy. All politicians recognize the force of public opinion.

For these reasons, in a struggle between a violent person and a non-violent resister, if there are any onlookers or a public who hear of the conflict, the non-violent resister gains a very strong advantage from their reaction. When the public see the gentle person's courage and fortitude, note his generosity and good will toward the attacker, and hear his repeated offers to settle the matter fairly and peaceably and in the open, they are filled with surprise, curiosity and wonder. If they have been hostile to the victim before, they at least pause to think. His good humour, fairness and kindness arouse confidence. Sooner or later his conduct wins public sympathy, admiration, and support, and also the respect of the violent opponent himself. Gandhi's chivalrous and generous conduct toward the South African Government when it was threatened by a railway strike is an instance of this sort. Once the respect of the opponent has been secured, a long step has been taken toward a satisfactory solution of the controversy, no matter whether it be public or private.

But what is the psychology of the affair if the assailant is filled with the sort of cruelty or greed, pride, bigotry, or hardness that seems to grow on what it feeds on?

Cruelty is a complex of fear, anger and pride.¹⁴ Greed is really a desire for security and completion, though badly

mistaken as to method, means and material. In a sense it is a fear of lack. Pride is another mistaken sense of divisiveness. Bigotry is an obstinate narrow religious pride.

In all such instances the tendency of non-violent resistance is to remove fear, anger, and any foreboding or dread of loss or sense of separateness,¹⁵ and to give instead a feeling of security, unity, sympathy, and good will. Inasmuch as fear and anger are elements of cruelty, the removal of fear and anger will tend to reduce cruelty. Shand tells us ¹⁶ that "wonder tends to exclude Repugnance, Disgust and Contempt in relation to its object." In so far as these may be elements involved in pride, the wonder evoked by the conduct of the non-violent person also tends to reduce pride and hence to reduce cruelty. In so far as cruelty is due to a desire for power or for feeling superior; the ability of non-violent resistance to win for its user the support of the outside public presently makes the cruel person realize that that sort of power is disadvantageous and that perhaps he is not so superior as he had previously supposed. Even aside from its effect on the spectators, non-violent resistance gradually creates even in the violent opponent a partial realization of human unity and a different idea of what kind of power is desirable. To the extent that cruelty may be due to a defect in the cruel person's intelligence or imagination or to dullness of observation, the dramatic scenes of prolonged non-violent resistance act to stimulate his intelligence and powers of observation, and hence to reduce his cruelty. If avarice, ambition, or desire for revenge are factors in a particular case of cruelty, these also are reduced by prolonged non-violent resistance. The removal of fear or of sense of separateness tends to reduce greed and hardness.

The attacker gradually loses divisive emotions or sentiments in relation to the victim, — fear, anger, hatred, indignation, pride, vanity, scorn, contempt, disdain, disgust, anxiety, worry, apprehension. It is not that such

feelings are balked or suppressed ; — they merely no longer have a cause or basis.

The art of jiu-jitsu is based on a knowledge of balance and how to disturb it. In a struggle of moral jiu-jitsu the retention of moral balance seems to depend upon the qualities of one's relationship to moral truth. Hence part of the superior power of the non-violent resister seems to lie in the nature of his character.

He must have primarily that disposition best known as love ; — an interest in people so deep, and determined, and lasting as to be creative ; a profound knowledge of or faith in the ultimate possibilities of human nature ; a courage based upon a conscious or subconscious realization of the underlying unity of all life and eternal values or eternal life of the human spirit ; a strong and deep desire for and love of truth ; and a humility which is not cringing or self-deprecatory or timid but rather a true sense of proportion in regard to people, things, qualities and ultimate values. These human traits of love, faith, courage, honesty and humility exist in greater or less strength in *every* person. By self-training and discipline they can be developed sufficiently to make a good non-violent "soldier" out of average human material. Of course, leaders of a non-violent movement require these qualities to an unusual degree, just as generals of military armies require military qualities developed to a higher degree than those of the common soldier.

Not only is love the most important of all these qualities of the non-violent person ; it may almost be considered the origin of all the others. If the name "love" in such a context seems too impossible or sentimental, call it a sort of intelligence or knowledge.¹⁷ This love must be strong and clear-sighted, not mawkish or sentimental. It does not state or hint that it is going to "do good to" the other person, nor does it make a parade of itself. It must be patient and full of insight and understanding and imagination. It must be enduring, kind and unselfish. It is wonderful but it is not super-human or exceedingly rare.

We have all seen such love in many mothers of all classes, nations and races, also in the best teachers. Its creativeness in these instances is well known.

If through love for your enemy you can create in him respect or admiration for you, this provides the best possible means by which your new idea or suggestion to him will become an auto-suggestion within him, and it will also help nourish that auto-suggestion.

Anger, as well as love, can be creative, for both are expressions or modes of energy. But love contains more energy and endurance than anger. Love involves the very principle and essence of continuity of life itself. If considered as an instrument, it can be more efficiently and effectively wielded, has better aim, has a better fulcrum or point of vantage, than anger. Love gains a stronger and more lasting approval from the rest of mankind. The probabilities in favour of its winning over anger in the long run are strong.

But if one party to a contest cannot develop toward the conflict or toward his opponent an attitude that is creative or akin to love, he should certainly be honest and true to himself.¹⁸ As long as men have uncontrollable anger or enmity in their feelings it is better to express it honestly and courageously than to be hypocritical and refuse to fight out of cowardice. Christ, searching for a change in men more profound and important than immediate external acts, told them to get rid of anger and greed, knowing that if this took place, war would disappear.

Courageous violence, to try to prevent or stop a wrong, is better than cowardly acquiescence. Cowardice is more harmful morally than violence. The inner attitude is more important than the outer act, though it is vitally important always to be true to oneself, to make one's outer conduct a true reflection and expression of one's inner state. Fear develops out of an assumption of relative weakness. Since all men have the innate possibility of moral strength, to be afraid is really a denial of one's

moral potential powers and is therefore very harmful. Violence and anger at least show faith in one's own moral powers and thus provide at least a basis for further growth. He who refrains from fighting because he is afraid, really hates his opponent in his heart and wishes that circumstances would change so that he could hurt or destroy his opponent. The energy of his hate is present but suppressed. If one has not the special courage or discipline or conviction to resist wrong or violence without counter-violence, then I agree with Gandhi that it is better to be violent than to be cowardly.¹⁹ But he who has the courage to fight and yet refrains, is the true non-violent resister. Because the coward fears, he cannot love, and if he cannot love he cannot be wholly successful in non-violent resistance. He cannot use this moral jiu-jitsu completely effectively. Refraining from outward violent acts through fearless self-control of anger is better than acting violently ; but getting rid of anger is best of all, and the only sure way. True non-violent resistance, where the outer act is an expression of inner attitude, gradually creates among all beholders an awareness of essential human unity. But if the inner condition is one of anger or hate, cowardly non-violence of deed is inconsistent with the inner condition, and this cowardly inconsistency or insincerity is soon detected by others and perhaps openly called hypocrisy ; and this inconsistency makes impossible any considerable increase in the awareness of essential unity.

As to the outcome of a struggle waged by non-violence, we must understand one point thoroughly. The aim of the non-violent resister is not to injure, or crush and humiliate his opponent, or to "break his will," as in a violent fight. The aim is to convert the opponent, to change his understanding and his sense of values so that he will join wholeheartedly with the resister in seeking a settlement truly amicable and truly satisfying to both sides. The non-violent resister seeks a solution under which both parties can have complete self-respect and

mutual respect ; a settlement that will implement the new desires and full energies of both parties. The non-violent resister seeks to help the violent attacker re-establish his moral balance on a level higher and more secure than that from which he first launched his violent attack. The method withdraws a mistaken support not in order to harm the opponent but to help both parties into a more secure, creative, happy, and truthful relationship.²⁰

CHAPTER III

WHAT HAPPENS

What more is there about the subtle interplay of forces operating during the struggle ? For purposes of explanation, we may somewhat arbitrarily analyse and consider these forces in two groups, — those which are mainly unconscious and those which are mainly conscious. In operation they are all inextricably mingled, but our minds can understand the matter better by discussing the processes as if they were separate.

One of these processes is what psychologists call suggestion. The surprising conduct of the non-violent resister presents suddenly to the violent assailant the new ideas that the dispute can be settled calmly and amicably ; that calm conduct is more dignified, more decent, more efficient, more worthy of respect than violence ; that there are some values and imponderable forces in the world perhaps even more powerful and desirable than physical force ; that the position of the attacker is much less favourable than he at first thought ; that perhaps the two parties are not enemies after all.

The attacker is at the moment in a most receptive and suggestible state, as we pointed out in the previous chapter. He is excited, and, because of his wonder, his attention is spontaneously concentrated on these new ideas. Under such conditions suggestion acts most potently.

"Suggestion is essentially a process of the unconscious."¹ Sensitiveness to folk environment is instinctive and therefore subconscious.²

It is well known that subconscious suggestions are both powerful and lasting. The spectacle of bravely endured suffering along with all the surprises and uncertainty of the situation creates emotion in the attacker. If there is a crowd present, it tends to heighten his suggestibility. These suggestions tend to change his inner attitude.

Or we may state it thus. If you would conquer another man, do it not by outside resistance but by creating inside his own personality an impulse too strong for his previous tendency. Reinforce your suggestion by making it auto-suggestion in him, so that it lives by his energy instead of by yours. And yet that new impulse is not to conflict directly with his former urge, but to divert and blend with it and absorb it, so as to use the full psychological energy of both impulses. That is the wisest psychological dynamics and moral strategy.

The new ideas in the astonishing situation tend strongly to stimulate the attacker's imagination. The Nancy school of psychologists maintains that imagination and suggestion together are much stronger than conscious will power, so that if a person consciously wills and thinks that he desires to accomplish a given purpose but all the while his imagination is filled with ideas of his inability to accomplish it or of some contrary desire, then he will surely fail in the task. Baudouin states it as the "Law of Reversed Effort." He says, "When the will and imagination are at war, the imagination *invariably* gains the day."³

If this be so, it may be that the ideas thus suggested to the attacker gradually capture his imagination and conquer his will to defeat the victim by violence. The Freudians show how much more powerful is a repressed wish than an opposing conscious desire. Possibly a suggestion acting imaginatively in the subconsciousness is as powerful as a repressed wish.

Undoubtedly the sight of another person voluntarily undergoing suffering for a belief or ideal moves the assailant and beholders alike and tends to change their hearts and make them all feel kinship with the sufferer.

There are perhaps two reasons for this. One is as follows. Our ancestors from the dawn of life have suffered pain and deprivation, so extensively and so intensely in the long course of evolution, that suffering is very familiar to our entire nervous system. Indeed, it is almost habitual to the human species. Probably the nervous system is as much or more responsive or sensitive to all stimuli associated with pain than to any other type of stimulus. Hence the sight of suffering, in all probability, causes an involuntary sympathetic response in the nervous system of the beholder, especially in the autonomic nervous system. The response may be inhibited or crusted over by custom, prejudice or hostile emotions, but it is there, nevertheless, at least in the subconsciousness. Therefore, the spectacle of a non-violent resister submitting himself voluntarily to bodily suffering for the sake of his cause would rouse in the onlooker, sympathetic emotion and a sense of kinship. If the sight were prolonged or frequently repeated, the effect would be all the stronger. There seems to be a social as well as an individual subconsciousness, through which such feelings would function.⁴

Again, everyone wants, in his heart, to be strong and brave. Every child has dreamed and fancied itself heroic. Therefore, when we see suffering valiantly endured, we admire the sufferer, we wonder if we could do so well, and perhaps we even unconsciously identify ourselves with him. Such processes of the imagination tend to produce a feeling of sympathy.

Thus the voluntary, long sustained, steady, disciplined suffering of a non-violent resister acts as a powerful suggestion of human unity.

Another process affecting the attacker is unconscious imitation. Imitation is an exceedingly powerful force by

which we learn to talk and walk, learn skilled manual trades, pick up gestures and postures of our elders, follow our leaders,—a limitless range of conduct. It lasts throughout life. Rivers tells us that "Unwitting imitation is the most effective."⁵

Ross remarks⁶ that "Motor impulses appear to diffuse themselves with great facility," citing the infectiousness of marching rhythm, yawning, gestures, and modes of speech. Also that "The feelings are more contagious than the appetites"... "Emotions spread more rapidly than ideas or opinions"... "Volitions are extremely communicable."

Kempf,⁷ after giving numerous examples of conscious and unconscious imitation, says, "The influence of associates upon the personality is a physiological mechanism and occurs unconsciously, or at least begins unconsciously." Later⁸ he partially adopts Holt's theory that "thought is latent course of action with regard to environment," that is to say "the preceding labile interplay of motor settings." This suggests the reason why pupils learn better by personal discussion with the teacher than by reading a book. They can imitate unconsciously the postures, tonus and play of motor settings of the teacher and thus follow and understand the thought more clearly and surely. Such a mode of influence would be both subtle and powerful. Similarly when an attacker watches his victim and comes to respect his courage, be it ever so little, he begins unconsciously to imitate him, and hence the attacker's wrath tends to subside. Whatever truth there may be in the James-Lange theory of the emotions would add weight to this conjecture. For reasons already considered, the peaceful contestant is less apt to be influenced by suggestion and imitation, to adopt violence, than the violent person to be influenced toward non-violence.

If one doubts the existence of imitation in time of conflict, let him remember the words of the great theorist of war, von Clausewitz, "War is a constant case of

reciprocal action, the effects of which are mutual." ⁹ Again Lieut.-General von Caemmerer, in his "Development of Strategical Science," ¹⁰ says, "Every action in war is saturated with mental forces and effects. . . . War is a constant reciprocal effect of action of both parties." ¹¹ This is true also of a conflict between individuals.

This factor of imitation also helps explain the futility of violence as a means of solving conflicts. If A attacks B, and B responds with violence, while part of B's response is purely instinctive and defensive, part of it also is unconscious imitation of A. Then the two act like front and back logs in a fire. The heat of one log is reflected across to the other, which then fires up and sends more heat to the first. The heat is reflected back and forth, steadily increasing and consuming the material (latent energy) of the wood. So anger, resentment, hatred and revenge, in the process of reciprocal imitative violence, mount higher and enter into more and more of the personalities of the combatants, consuming all their energies, to the point of utter exhaustion or destruction.¹²

Non-violent resistance is in effect a sort of language, a means of communicating feelings and ideas. It uses the expression of the face, glances of the eye, tones, intensities and modulations of the voice, movements and postures of the limbs and body, — just as in all personal communication. In prolonged situations it may also use writing and printing. Its means of expression are as ample as those of any language. Even in situations where words can be used little or not at all, conduct alone may be a rapid, accurate, and efficient means of communication.¹³

Nevertheless, the ideas to be conveyed are so unusual that the understanding of them by the recipient may be slow or incomplete. At first and perhaps for some time, the understanding will be more emotional than intellectual. Therefore, the success of the communication does not depend upon the extent of formal or book education of either party to the conflict. The idea itself is no more complex than that of war, for war involves a discipline

of fear, and non-violent resistance involves a discipline of anger; and both anger and fear are elemental and similar emotions. There is both an emotional and an intellectual element to be transmitted,—both feelings and ideas. There will be difficulties arising from the unusualness of the feelings and ideas, but no more difficulties arising from inadequacy of means than in the case of any other sort of language.¹⁴

Another largely unconscious process at work is the creative power of trust and expectation evinced by the non-violent resister. He tries to give concrete and repeated evidence of his trust in the decency and reasonableness of the violent attacker, and of his expectation that this fine spirit, perhaps only latent at the start, will grow stronger until it informs, controls, and changes the assailant into non-violent and kindly ways. This belief gives the resister hope, and he acts and holds himself in, an attitude of expectancy and trust. Trust, like its grosser form of financial credit, is subtly but powerfully creative. An example of this firm attitude of expectancy and hope was shown by Gandhi in going to the second Round Table Conference at London in 1931. Although no results of it were then visible in the British Government, there is evidence of considerable effect upon numerous persons who met Gandhi privately at that time.¹⁵

Modern psychologists tell us that much the greater part of our mind is subconscious. If the total mind may be likened to an iceberg floating in the water, one tenth of whose bulk is above the surface and nine tenths below the surface of the water, the importance of the conscious mind resembles the small part above the level of the water; the subconscious mind is equivalent to the greater bulk under the water. If this analogy be true, it is clear that forces or processes which operate upon a person's subconsciousness,—whether the process be one of suggestion, imagination-stimulus, imitation, communication, or trust,—would have a greater effect than those which operate only or chiefly upon the conscious mind and

conscious feelings. This would presumably hold true of a group as well as of an individual. The analogy may be carried further. When an iceberg drifts into warm waters the submerged part melts and melts, with perhaps only slight changes visible above the surface. But after the melting underneath has gone far enough, sometimes the entire iceberg suddenly turns over and thereafter looks entirely different. So sometimes sudden reversals come about among people as a result of forces acting a long time on the subconsciousness. It is not a miracle, but merely an instance of the operation of forces which we usually ignore. The analogy would tend to explain in part some of the impressive results of Gandhi's march to the sea in 1930 to make salt in defiance of the British Government.

The total effect of these psychological processes taking place in the mind and heart of the violent opponent can best be described by the word "conversion". Probably the process is analogous to that of religious conversion, though in this case the change is moral rather than religious. The process may be explained as follows :

Every civilized person possesses in either his conscious or subconscious mind a store of elementary moral memories. Some of these are myths, fables, stories or other fictitious events which, as a child, he took for realities ; some are moral relationships or moral standards impressed upon the individual at various stages in his development. Some of these have been repressed because they were inconsistent with subsequent courses of conduct. Others have been forgotten simply from lack of use or lack of attention. Each such residue of former beliefs or impressions is composed of representational, emotional, and motor factors associated into a unit, and each of these units seems to have more or less psychic energy.

During a prolonged struggle between a non-violent resister and a violent opponent, the psychological processes which we have described, together with the emotional and moral perturbation caused thereby, operate

apparently to recall to consciousness some of the forgotten elemental fragments of moral memories, to dissociate some of the complexes and sentiments which have been controlling the violent person's conduct, to separate from those complexes and sentiments their emotional tone and psychic energy, and transfer such emotion and energy to some of those revived memories, or to form a fresh combination of such psychic elements and attach the emotion and psychic energy to those new combinations. The psychologists of the psycho-analytical school call this shifting of emotional tone and energy "displacement". Along with this shifting of the representational, feeling, and motor factors of the psychic units, and their re-association into new "constellations," the experiences of the struggle also tend to induce in the attacker a sublimation of his desires and energies, — a lifting of them to a more social level, a re-directing of them in a more inclusive synthesis in which they can be reconciled with more of the finer ideals of human association.^{15a}

Non-violent resistance in complete form is a dramatization of the idea of essential human unity. Therefore, with all the subtle power of sincere drama, it works upon the mind and heart of the opponent. In this drama the movement and confronting of ideas and forces probably causes in the opponent and spectator a clearer and profounder realization of human relationships, a reconciliation of impulses, and an illumination, enlargement, and enrichment of consciousness. It probably brings about a more highly organized and more delicately balanced synthesis of the elements in the spectator's experience, an inner organization "less wasteful of human possibilities" ^{15b} than that which prevailed in him before. It reveals the power of the human soul, its ability to triumph over suffering and apparent disaster.

In addition to these processes which are mainly subconscious in their operation, there are others which are perhaps chiefly conscious.

The psychological nature of non-violent resistance may well be considered a form of what Rivers called "manipulative activity". In discussing different modes of reaction to danger; he says,¹⁶

"In the presence of danger man, in the vast majority of cases, neither flees nor adopts an attitude of aggression, but responds by the special kind of activity, often of a highly complex kind, whereby the danger may be avoided or overcome. From most of the dangers to which mankind is exposed in the complex conditions of our own society, the means to escape lie in complex activities of a manipulative kind which seem to justify the term I have chosen. The hunter has to discharge his weapon, perhaps combined with movements which put him into a favourable situation for such an action. The driver of a car and the pilot of an aeroplane in danger of collision have to perform complex movements by which the danger is avoided."

We may say that non-violent resistance is a sort of moral manipulative activity in which the factors used and operated upon are largely psychological.

It may clarify our thinking somewhat to remember that we are not considering two static entities, an angry person versus a kindly person. We are rather dealing with two natures and an environment which are all mobile and changing, each constantly acting on the other, — influencing, changing, then responding to the new condition thus created.¹⁷

Another process develops after the struggle has proceeded some time, — namely that of reassurance of the violent party. Much of the opponent's original basis of anger or fear is removed. The assailant finds that the resister does not bear enmity toward him. He finds that at least his "better self" and potentialities are respected instead of humiliated; he finds his original desires so illuminated and transmuted that in their new form they may be more easily satisfied. He finds the resister always ready to negotiate and showing and inviting him to take a dignified way by which he, the assailant, may quickly regain his self-respect and public esteem. Since he has been provided with a satisfactory road for action, he is

not left with any "balked disposition" as Graham Wallas calls it.

Then comes the stage of what Miss M. P. Follett calls "integration". In her very thoughtful book, "Creative Experience,"¹⁸ she shows that either voluntary submission of one side, struggle and victory of one side over the other, or a compromise, are all highly unsatisfactory and productive of further trouble. She then explains a fourth way, "integration".

Integration is arrived at by first analysing the expressed desires of the opponents into their elements and more fundamental meanings. For instance, to take a simple case, an insistence on having a table in a certain place in a room might really mean a wish to have light on one's writing while working at the table, together with an inability to see how it could be secured in any other way. The desire of Russia to control the Dardenelles may really mean a desire for security in free trade. Insistence upon following a given kind of trade may mean a need for employment, a desire for money, and a desire to satisfy pride. An insistence upon political control of a certain territory may mean a need for food and industrial raw material and a desire to satisfy pride, and an inability to see how the satisfaction of these needs can be made wholly secure in any other way.

The integration consists of inventing and working out a wholly new solution, perhaps involving very different activities, which satisfies all or most of the fundamental desires and needs of both parties in a situation, and utilizes freely and fully the energies of both without balking or suppression. The integration requires preliminary analysis, then an invention of a new solution which gives free scope to the energies of all parties concerned. Inevitably the solution is satisfying all around.

It takes much creative intelligence and ingenuity to find integrations, and not all differences can be integrated immediately. Temporary compromises can be made,

however, pending the further search and alterations due to passage of time, ending in an ultimate integration.¹⁹

In this connection it is well to remember the importance of love. Love for an opponent makes possible the sympathetic appreciation of the real meaning and value of the opponent's contentions, positions, and desires, and gives a willingness to approach them open-mindedly, creating the right atmosphere for an integration of both sets of interests to a higher plane of action. Also it induces a frame of mind in the opponent which leads him to understand *your* needs, contentions, etc. And it shows the opponent that you are so appreciative of his side of the case that he can safely trust you.

Miss Follett's idea of integration indicates that non-violent resistance, as a method, by itself does not necessarily settle all the conflict. It may be said to solve most of the emotional part, — the fear, anger, pride, etc., — while the rest of the conflict may have to be solved by keen and perhaps prolonged intellectual exploration, with the new emotional attitude always at its elbow to help over the tight places.

All this ebb and flow of feeling and action and discussion may take place in different order from that described above. Its temper and intensity may vary according to the circumstances and character of the persons involved. It might take a considerable time to work through. Between sensitive persons the course of feelings and actions might be almost instantaneous. With a very proud or self-deceiving person, or a hardened soldier or policeman as attacker, the actual violence might be severe and repeated and lasting before the change of attitude or heart of the attacker would come about. Yet even among such attackers the surprise and wonder would be so great as often to cause a far quicker face-about and solution than might at first be expected.

And when a solution is found there is satisfaction and good feeling and finer attitude and action not only among

the participants to the struggle but among all the onlookers and public. To have the finer potentialities of men flower forth and bear fruit enhances the morale of all who learn of it.

CHAPTER IV

UTILIZING EMOTIONAL ENERGY

As a method of solving a conflict, non-violent resistance is sounder than reciprocal violence because it is more efficient.¹

The first reason for this is partly physiological. Anger, hatred, and fear make an enormous drain upon our energy.² Hatred eats up our energies and our imaginations. If you hate a man sufficiently, you cannot get him out of your mind, you are attached to him, you are his slave. The thought of him is an obsession ; it wastes most of your time.

In a violent struggle these emotions persist after the combat itself ceases. A victory by violence means humiliation for the conquered. He has had to admit the winner's superiority for the moment but he vows vengeance. His resentment seeks satisfaction as soon as possible. His original anger, repressed by circumstances, becomes hatred and longs for revenge and retaliation. He nurses his grudge. His sympathetic family or friends may make his case their own. Perhaps a feud or vendetta develops. There have been many instances of feuds lasting many generations. International enmities in Europe have lasted for centuries. Retaliation provokes counter-retaliation. The original evil or damage is vastly multiplied, and absorbs an enormous amount of time and energy away from useful occupations.

This wider and slower-acting effect of revenge and resentment is usually overlooked or minimized by the militarists and glorifiers of war and physical force. But it holds true whether the struggle is between two individuals,

between one person and a group or between two or more groups, — whether the groups be small or large. It holds true in varying degrees whether the original combat ended with no permanent injury to either side, with some injury, or with death. It runs through all forms, — the spanking of a child, a fight, a criminal arrest and imprisonment, capital punishment, a lynching, a strike or riot, piracy, a military raid or “punitive expedition”, a civil or international war. Rarely does a peace settlement bring full satisfaction, forgiveness and solution of the entire original conflict, so that both parties feel thoroughly happy and ready to go ahead without suspicion or resentment. Anger is thus inefficient in both methods and results.

The peaceful resister has to expend much energy, but he applies it more intelligently than does the violent man. He selects the really important forces in the environment and seeks to alter them.³ The angry and violent man puts too much emphasis on immediate objects and too little on the ultimate impelling forces behind them. If he considers impelling forces, he does not analyse them sufficiently or go far enough back. He has to waste much energy because, as it were he uses too short leverages in attempting to move or divert opposing objects or forces. The non-violent resister, by using longer psychological leverages, may have to move more slowly sometimes, but the work is more efficiently done and tends to be more permanent.

What the American psychiatrist, W. A. White, says of conflicting tendencies in the individual may be applied as well to a conflict between two persons :

“It follows from all this that the symbolization of the conflict, either in the dream or in the symptoms of the neurosis or psychosis, will contain elements representative of both factors, and also that no solution of the conflict can come about except by the satisfaction of both these diametrically opposed tendencies. It follows, too, that no conflict can be solved at the level of the conflict. That is, two mutually opposed tend-

encies can never unite their forces except at a higher level, in an all inclusive synthesis which lifts the whole situation to a level above that upon which the conflict rose"... 4

Mutual violent struggle is an attempt to solve a contest "at the level of the conflict". The defeat of either party results in suppression or repression of the energy of the wishes or will of the defeated party which is certain to result in waste, friction and trouble sooner or later. The repressed energy of the thwarted or defeated person, will eventually find an outlet, a sort of revenge.⁵ But non-violent resistance, followed up with moderate wisdom, offers a solution which gives satisfactory scope for the energies of both parties. Often it enhances their energies, as a result of the subsequent good feeling. New associations open up new channels for pleasurable and fruitful activity. A synthesis of both energies is similar to what the Freudians call a "sublimation".

The non-violent resister does not want a passive compliance from the attacker, such as would be secured by using successful counter-violence against him. He wants the full energy of the attacker's active help. Therefore he tries to make it easy and reasonable for the attacker to join forces in the new programme. He knows that the pattern of a peaceful stimulus to the violent one is more harmonious, more "voluminous", and therefore more potent and efficient than a violent, i.e. intense and painful, stimulus would be.⁶

Peace imposed by violence is not psychological peace but a suppressed conflict. It is unstable for it contains the seeds of its own destruction. The outer condition is not a true reflection of the inner condition. But in peace secured by true non-violent resistance there is no longer any inner conflict but a new channel found in which both the formerly conflicting energies are at work in the same direction and in harmony. Here the outer condition truly reflects the inner condition. This is perhaps one reason why Gandhi calls this mode of solving conflict Satyagraha, —holding to truth. Such a peace is enduring.

If we are to find something which will overcome anger and fear, it must be in principle the opposite of them and stronger than they are. Usually we think of courage as the opposite of fear. But really courage is only a partial antithesis. Courage implies a readiness to fight, to risk oneself, to match strength against strength, intelligence against intelligence. Courage, like anger, implies an attempt to end the threat of the opposing force or person by driving it away, making it submissive or destroying it, but does not usually imply rising above it and utilizing its energy in a higher synthesis. That is to say, courage implies willingness to engage in conflict on the same plane in which the threatening force is found, perhaps because of an estimation of superior strength or perhaps because of a consciousness of or faith in a higher security, and this means trying to suppress the energy of the force opposed. But love involves not only a willingness to take risks and face the threatening force, but also a desire and usually an ability to lift the conflict to a higher plane, and in that higher plane utilize the energy of the opposing force in a higher integration or sublimation. Love is stronger than fear and anger; for one reason, because it is able to manipulate and guide their energy. It is more intelligent and far-seeing, as it were. It is also stronger because it is a more inclusive sentiment than fear or anger or hate, as has already been explained. Love means using in the moral sphere the principle of the resolution of forces, known to every schoolboy who has studied physics, instead of the wasteful principle of direct opposition and consequent waste of energy and unsatisfactory and only temporary results. Love does something better than conquer, for conquest implies destruction, submission and suppression. Love is more intelligent and tries not to allow any energy to go to waste.

In so far as life is made up of a flow of energy, any principle is sound which increases the flow of energy, and makes possible the joining and mutual reinforcement of

two or more channels of energy. An increase of life energy gives power and joy.

So love is a great principle in moral mechanics. It does not suppress or thwart the energy behind fear and anger but uses it, and finds ways to steer it into channels desirable to both parties to the conflict. Fear and anger both involve an idea of separation, a flight or a driving away or extinction. Love, on the other hand, involves the idea of unity and attraction. It is, therefore, the true opposite, the sound principle by which to eliminate fear, anger, pride, and all other divisive emotions and attitudes.

"Against the superiority of another there exists no weapon or remedy save love."⁷ All this makes clear, perhaps, why it has been said that "Perfect love casteth out fear."

From all this we see that non-violent resistance is psychologically more efficient than violence.

Problems of conflict cannot, however, always be solved by firm refusals, kindly spirit, a desire for settlement and prolonged thinking and discussion. Further action is often necessary for psychological completeness and in order to expand and exemplify ideas sufficiently to make a real settlement. William James pointed out that it is psychologically unhealthy to feel an emotion or impulse and not give it fairly prompt expression in action.⁸ And in certain situations and with certain people action must be immediate, — action which is constructive of a new order and thereby resistant to the old order. We tend to believe that thought clarifies action and should precede action as the architect's plan precedes the construction of a building, but often in actual life action precedes thought and clarifies thought and even creates it. A sudden uprush of creative energy from the subconscious may discharge immediately into action without becoming conscious thought or taking time to find words until later. Action may, indeed, be considered a mode of thought. Such action by the true peaceful resister is not an expression of suppressed anger or indignation, but an immediate creative urge of the whole personality. In certain

situations such action is tremendously energetic and swift, — a sudden surge of power that is almost explosive. It may clear the air like a flash of lightning and prove wonderfully refreshing. It may help to create new values.

Examples of this sudden and immensely energetic action are found in the Indian Nationalist movement of 1930. The wide-spread manufacture of salt in opposition to the Government salt monopoly, the refusal to pay taxes, the picketing of liquor and opium shops, the combination of making homespun cloth and picketing shops selling foreign cloth are specific instances. These activities were non-violent. They aimed at replacing a pre-existing order by a new order. They were intended to put an end, among the masses, to the pre-existing fear of the Government, and to stimulate courage, self-reliance, self-respect and political unity. They actually had that effect in large measure. Other examples of sudden strong action which is resistant in one aspect and creative in another will readily occur to parents, experienced teachers, and those who have dealt much with modern reform efforts among delinquent children.

Action of this sort often seems necessary in the case of young persons, young mass movements and young nations. The earlier stages of life are primarily motor in character, and at that period strenuous action must follow promptly after thoughts and feelings and may often precede thought and accompany feeling from its beginning. Perhaps certain pathological conditions of human relationships require sudden and drastic action to create a better order. There is evidence indicating that the politico-economic relations between Britain and India had by 1930 reached a state which was morally pathological.⁹

When we come to consider the history and evolution of the instinct of pugnacity we find further assurance of the validity of the method of non-violent resistance.

Hocking, in his "Human Nature and Its Remaking" already cited, has¹⁰ an exceedingly interesting discussion of this point which may be summarized as follows:

In its original and crudest form pugnacity requires the destruction of its object. But with the higher animals and man, destruction results in a partial defeat of one's total wish. The conqueror has enough interest in the survival of his opponent to want to see its chagrin and its acknowledgment of him as victor. The feeling "I want destruction" becomes "I want revenge." But revenge likes to nurse itself and persist, and this tends toward prolonging the vanquished's life so as to enjoy his discomfiture to the utmost. And the intensity of hatred in the victims of ruthless revenge becomes a danger. So revenge develops into punishment. Punishment tries to inflict pain but without permanent injury. It discriminates between the *evil* of will of the opponent and the will itself, just as revenge distinguished between the will and the life. Punishment tried to get rid of "an evil element in the will of another while retaining the integrity of, and the regard for that will as a whole." The next step was a sort of therapeutic improvement, a discovery of a better way to cure an evil or defective element in an opponent's will. Punishment always resulted in some degree of bitterness or hatred, which interfered with the cure of the will. It was discovered that kindness and friendliness induce a desire in the opponent's own mind and heart to get rid of the defect or difficulty, a sort of auto-suggestion which was most efficient. Thus long-continued experience has brought the shrewdest men to realize that the earlier and cruder expressions of pugnacity and anger "are not what the human being, on the whole, wants." What a person really wants is the richest and fullest possible expression of his energy, and to attain that completely there must be an equally rich and full expression of energy by all other persons. Such is the evolution of the instinct of pugnacity.

"The doctrine of pacifism," it has been said, "is a perfectly natural development, and ultimately inevitable in an animal having an unlimited appetite for experience and an indestructible inheritance of social instinct."—11

Altruism is

"a characteristic of the gregarious animal, and a perfectly normal and necessary development in him of his instinctive inheritance.—The biologist...is aware that altruism...is the direct outcome of instinct, and that it is a source of strength because it is a source of union."

Apparently certain instincts are of more use to the herd at an early stage of its development than at a later stage.

Perhaps the East, as expressed by Buddha, Hindu ethics, the Jainas, Lao Tsu, Christ and Gandhi, has studied psychology and "behaviourism" more profoundly than any modern Westerners have yet succeeded in doing. The Oriental terminology may be different from ours but that does not make the conclusions less wise. The dense population and prolonged ages of intense social experience of India, China and other Asiatic civilizations brought about an insight and realization of the psychological validity of non-violent resistance. Modern development of swift means of communication and transportation, the shocks and suffering of the Great War, and the researches of Western psychology are perhaps tending to have the same effect as the dense population and long-sustained experience of the East; thus, maybe, preparing the Western mind to realize the same truth.

CHAPTER V

HOW IS MASS NON-VIOLENCE POSSIBLE ?

The wisdom of the East is gradually being approached in the West by way of scientific psychology and analysis. Many of our social problems will reach solution only after we apprehend more clearly the processes of our own thinking and emotions. A full understanding of conflict, between groups as well as between individuals, requires comprehension of the dynamic aspects of fear and anger, and of their results in action.

Fear and anger are closely allied. They have the same origin or purpose,—to separate a person from a living creature, force or situation considered by the person to be painful, threatening or dangerous to his comfort, well-being, the easy action of his instincts, or his very existence. If the person feels that he is stronger than the threatening force or situation, the emotion is anger ; while if he estimates the danger as stronger than himself (including his skill), the emotion is fear.¹

"In anger the removal may be effected by driving it (the threatening object) from the environment, destroying its consistency, or, if it is a threatening posture in another animal the removal may consist of merely changing the aggressive posture of the opponent into a submissive one."²

Hate is a sort of deferred or thwarted anger. The hated person or force is too strong to be removed or destroyed, and yet not strong enough to cause flight or abject submission. Therefore the person puts up with it, wishing all the time to destroy or harm it but not quite daring to do so, waiting for an opportunity to weaken or destroy it, but restraining his anger from blazing forth into open combat.

It seems from this that fear is always a *fear of losing* something considered valuable. Always a loss or separation of some sort is threatened. So a sense of impending or possible loss is always the basis of both fear and anger.

If that threat is wholly removed, the fear and anger also disappear.³

The instinct of flight corresponds to or operates along with the emotion of fear, while the instinct of pugnacity corresponds to or accompanies the emotion of anger. These instincts have the same purpose as these emotions, — to separate oneself from a painful or threatening force or situation.

This common motive or basis of these pairs of emotions and instincts provides the explanation of how mass non-violent resistance is possible and also practical. We know that the elemental instinct of flight and emotion of fear can be controlled and disciplined by military training. Ages of war have taught us that this control and discipline are practical and effective. Since that is possible, it is equally possible to control and discipline the parallel and equally elemental instinct of pugnacity and emotion of anger.

It may be said that the discipline of emotion and instinct involved in military war is feasible because courage comes to its aid. Courage seems to grow out of either a perception of superior strength, skill, endurance, or security, or the superiority of the instinct for race preservation over that of individual self-preservation, as where a mother sacrifices herself for her offspring.

But it is conceivable that in the case of non-violent resistance there is another sort of courage, growing out of a different type of strength, skill, endurance or security; or perhaps here, too, there may be a factor operating for the preservation of the race,—a more far-seeing factor, as it were. The race has had more experience with the discipline of war than with the discipline of non-violent resistance but that does not make the creation and maintenance of the latter discipline more difficult intrinsically, once the matter is fully understood. The new discipline would probably be quantitatively more difficult, because it involves control of both fear and anger; but not qualitatively or intrinsically more difficult,

because both these emotions are similar in origin and in ultimate purpose, namely, race-preservation through individual self-preservation. And it seems that now the human race has perhaps developed enough knowledge and intelligence for a larger number of its leaders to begin to grasp the possibilities of this novel discipline.⁴

The possibility of altering the expression of pugnacity and creating this new discipline will be readily appreciated by students of psychology by reference to Pavlov's researches on "conditioned reflexes".⁵ Without attempting here to explain conditioned reflexes, it may be stated that Pavlov has again and again, at will, been able to alter a dog's response to a destructive or painful stimulus from one of anger or defense to one of assimilation. Or to be specific, a dog's digestive reflex may be made to stop appearing in the presence of food, and instead to appear upon feeling pain from an electric shock or a burn of an acid on the skin. The reflex may be reconditioned to a new stimulus which was just the opposite sort from what would be expected.

J. B. Watson's experiments⁶ showing that a newborn baby has only two fears, — that of falling and of a sudden loud noise, — suggest that all other and more complex fears are conditioned reflexes. This would tend to support the idea of war as being in part a mass-conditioned reflex. To the extent that it is such, that part of it may be altered and re-conditioned, just as much as any other. Or if friendly behaviour or kindness can be considered in part a conditioned reflex, we may recondition that part of it to respond to hostile treatment. Of course both war and non-violent resistance are much more than reflexes or instinctive actions, for they involve complex sentiments and conscious discipline. Nevertheless, the instinctive or reflex elements in war are capable of further alteration and discipline.

But is not human nature too weak for this new discipline? Does it not make too heavy a drain on the resources of idealism, sentiment, emotion and moral

character of ordinary mankind? No, not under proper training, especially when coupled with understanding. It may take a few years to establish. It is said to take four years to make a good private soldier. New habits take time to become firm. "One lesson of the war is that discipline is effective in making good soldiers out of the most unpromising material."⁷ This is as true of the control or discipline of anger as it is of the discipline of fear. It is proved by the success in 1928, with the perfectly ordinary human material among the peasantry of Bardoli district, whereby as a result of several years of training, they conducted a wholly successful non-violent struggle against the Government of the Bombay Presidency (India) for a revision of the method of assessing land taxes. Those few thousand simple peasants won their fight on practically all the items of their original demands. A victory like this against the cleverest and most experienced ruling class in the world, is no small test of the efficacy of the method. More examples were cited in Chapter I.

Napoleon said that the value of discipline is seventy-five per cent of all the elements that go to make success in battle.⁸ Foch wrote, "Discipline constitutes the main strength of armies."⁹ The Duke of Wellington said, "Nature! Habit is ten times nature."¹⁰ This is just as true of the non-violent discipline as of the discipline in violence. Gandhi realized this when he called off the struggle for Indian political independence in 1922 after the Chauri-Chaura riots. He was sure that non-violent resistance was the only way by which India could gain her political freedom. He tried to teach and train India to use that weapon. But when many did not understand the new method or failed in their self-control so that there were riots in Bombay in November, 1921, and again in Chauri-Chaura in early 1922, he saw that they were not sufficiently disciplined. He could no more wage his kind of war with followers so undisciplined than Napoleon or Foch could win *their* kind without discipline. Therefore

he declined battle. But that did not mean that the *method* was a failure, but only that the new discipline was not sufficiently understood nor the training sufficiently prolonged. His hostile Indian critics in this matter did not understand the new method. Some of his formal opponents understood him better and appraised the power of his weapon more truly.¹¹

The failure at that time through lack of discipline no more proves that non-violent resistance is ineffective or futile or impossible than the many routs and flights in battle prove that armies and violence are ineffective and absurd. Nor do the deaths and sufferings of non-violent resisters in the past prove any more in this respect than the deaths and wounds of war. This was the first attempt to organize and discipline a large army of non-violent resisters. Is it surprising that there was enough indiscipline and misunderstanding to make it necessary to call a halt, execute a strategic retreat, and begin to reform the ranks and train them more intensively and fundamentally ?

As a matter of fact there was proportionately more misunderstanding and lack of discipline among the literate and "intelligentsia" of India than among the illiterate peasantry. This is natural, because absorption of Western ways of thinking was an influence in favour of Western ways. Mental habit is strong, and so it was not easy for the intelligentsia to understand this new concept and discipline. This largely accounts also for the misunderstanding of Gandhi in the West. Up till now, pacifists have not sufficiently realized either the possibilities of joint, corporate action in non-violent resistance, nor the necessity for discipline, nor the kind and intensity and many-sided details of that discipline.¹² They should learn from their friends the militarists.¹³

It may be said, "You have named certain instances when non-violent resistance has been successful, but there have been countless exceptions, so many that the exceptions are the rule." I grant the death of Jesus and the Christian martyrs, the slaughter of innocent thousands

by Jenghiz Khan and Tamerlane, the tortures of Albigenses, Negro lynchings and countless other instances. Some of these people, like many soldiers, won or established their causes even though they lost their own lives. Neither they nor their methods were any more "futile" than those of all soldiers. But perhaps most of them did not show true non-violent resistance. Maybe they were undisciplined or frightened or poorly led, and hence were unnecessarily killed and partly wasted, just as any undisciplined troops would be in war.

The failures and apparent futilities of non-violent resistance in the past have been due, very largely, to lack of discipline, as well as lack of understanding of the full implications and requirements of the method. Of course there are sure to be some casualties and losses under it, even at its best. But provided there is discipline and leadership which fully understands the psychological mechanisms and the moral and spiritual elements involved, I am convinced that the losses will be much less than in violent war. The calculus of moral probabilities gives this answer, and historical examples of its intelligent practice prove it, as we have already seen. Even in the case of individual encounters, if the method is used with understanding or faith, and complete sincerity, the chances of failure or death are less, I believe, than if violence is relied upon. And of course even where death occurs, the cause for which the man died may triumph in spite of his death or even because of it. The validity of the method is to be tested mainly by whether it can achieve success for its cause, but also partly by its ability to achieve such success with less destruction of life, physical injury or destruction of property than when violence is used. On both these points non-violent resistance wins, provided the discipline, understanding and leadership are sound. And all these are as possible with it as in the case of military methods.

An army can be effective without every soldier in it, or even a majority of them, being individual paragons of

intelligence and military virtue. Discipline removes most of the effect of their individual weaknesses and adds momentum to their virtues. It is the same with a group or army of disciplined non-violent resisters. If their leaders have the requisite attitude, understanding and intelligence, the rank and file may be ordinary human material at the start. The new training and discipline will improve them enormously, as it also asserted for military discipline. Presumably, the smaller the group, the more complete the discipline and understanding must be. Individuals using non-violent resistance alone would require more self-control and ability than is needed for a disciplined group. But even here the inner attitude and emotional understanding and control are much more important than any intellectual ability or experience in the rough-and-tumble world. Indeed, in certain situations so-called "intellect" and experience count for almost nothing.

Hence it is not necessary that every single person in a nation seeking freedom by non-violent resistance must be fully disciplined to non-violence, any more than every single citizen in a nation at war must be fully disciplined for active battle and wholly fearless under attack. Yet it is just as possible for whole nations to *understand* the idea, and to be so self-disciplined as to give the "troops" hearty support and do nothing (as by outbreaks of anger and violence, riots, etc.) to interfere with their operations, as it is in the case of whole nations understanding war and supporting their armies in time of war.

Violence is based upon fear and anger and uses them to the utmost. We have seen that these two emotions are based on the idea of separation, of division. Non-violent resistance, on the other hand, is based upon the idea of unity. The hypothesis of non-violent resisters is that the strongest factor in human beings, in the long run, is their unity ; — that they have more as a human family in common than as separate individuals. The basic assumption of these creative men of peace is that their opponents, no

matter how forbidding externally, or no matter what their past history, are at bottom decent and have in their hearts at least a spark of good spirit which can eventually be aroused and strengthened into action. Non-violent resisters have sound biological, psychological and historical evidence for this belief. If it were not true, the human race would long ago have ceased to exist.

CHAPTER VI

THE WORKING OF MASS NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

Assuming that the discipline of non-violence can be and has been attained how does it actually work in group or mass use?

Since war is the most highly developed and best understood mode of mass struggle, we will find our explanation first from authorities on the science and art of war.

Marshal Foch showed clearly by many examples, that the method of war is primarily psychological, or what he calls "moral".

"Proofs and instances could be given indefinitely of that great importance of morale in war. Von der Goltz himself tells us that; 'It is not so much a question of destroying the enemy troops as of destroying their courage. Victory is yours as soon as you convince your opponent that his cause is lost.' And again; 'One defeats the enemy not by individual and complete annihilation, but by destroying his hopes of victory.'" ¹

Marshal de Saxe remarked: "The secret of victory lies in the hearts of human beings." ² Napoleon stated that, "In war, the moral is to the physical as three is to one." Von Clausewitz, speaking of von Clausewitz's book on war says, ³ "As he pictures war, the struggle between the spiritual and moral forces on both sides is the centre of all." General Sir F. Maurice writes that war is "an act in which moral and psychological factors have a supreme influence." ⁴ Captain B. H. Liddell Hart says that the World War confirms "the immemorial lesson of history

— that the true aim in war is the mind of the enemy command and government, not the bodies of their troops, that the balance between victory and defeat turns on mental impressions and only indirectly on physical blows.”⁵

The object of non-violent resistance is partly analogous to this object of war, — namely, to demoralize the opponent, to break his will, to destroy his confidence, enthusiasm and hope. In another respect it is dissimilar, for non-violent resistance demoralizes the opponent only to re-establish in him a new morale that is finer because it is based on sounder values. Non-violent resistance does not break the opponent's will but alters it; does not destroy his confidence and enthusiasm and hope but transfers them to a finer purpose. But because we in the West are so thoroughly familiar with war and military ways of thinking, the fact that there is a partial analogy between the two methods of solving conflicts provides a bridge for our thinking. By following the analogy we Westerners can come to an understanding of the new method and its effectiveness.

As Hocking points out, “Morale is at the bottom a state of will or purpose.”⁶ It seems to rest largely upon such factors as the individual soldier's confidence in himself, in his comrades, in his army, in his leaders, in the methods used, in the cause for which the war is being waged, in his government, in the civilians of the nation behind them all. It also contains such elements as a sense of being merged into the larger unity of the army, habit, tradition, humour, and appreciation of risk and a relish for adventure.⁷

Suppose a group of non-violent resisters were opposed to a company of soldiers, in a case of a strike, or some non-violent Filipinos against the United States soldiers, or Indians against British soldiers. Suppose also that the soldiers attempted clubbing tactics or bayonet work. Let us assume also that the civilians have been non-violent from the start and there is no shooting by the soldiers.⁸ But suppose some violence by the soldiers, and arrests of

the civilians. Also that the cause is so strong that as fast as any are arrested, others come to take their places. What, presumably, would be the effect on the morale of the soldiers?

To a certain extent the effect would be the same as that described in the preceding chapter where an individual person violently attacks a non-violent resister. But the discipline and habits of the soldiers would largely prevent this from happening at first. The individual soldier's will has become merged with the general will of the army, and wholly subordinated to that of the commanding officer. He is used to rough tactics and is not at all squeamish about inflicting pain and injury on others.

Nevertheless, "One of the chief results of military training is to increase the suggestibility of the private."⁹ Of course, as Rivers points out, this suggestibility is chiefly in relation to the officers, but no doubt the soldiers are also suggestible in relation to the acts and conduct of their opponents or "enemies" because such acts and conduct are the whole object toward which the morale of the soldiers has been built up. This is also indicated by the remarks of von Clausewitz and von Caemmerer,¹⁰ "War is a constant state of reciprocal action, the effects of which are mutual." "Every action in war is saturated with mental forces and effects. . . . War is a constant reciprocal effect of action of both parties." This fact then would presently tend to offset a little the discipline and hardness of the soldiers.

The conduct of these civilians would cause surprise in the individual soldier and thus start him thinking. Frederick the Great wrote, "If my soldiers began to think, not one would remain in the ranks." As soon as a soldier begins to think of certain sorts of things, he begins to be an individual, to separate himself from the mass mind, the will and personality of the army. According to one surgeon in the British army, "The whole army training is designed for this one purpose of merging the individual into the mass."¹¹ If, then, the soldier is made to think for

himself in the midst of a conflict, it is the opening wedge for the disintegration of his morale. I do not mean to say that modern soldiers do no thinking at all, but it will be conceded that in these days of the printing press a very large proportion of all people do very little thinking for themselves. And among soldiers, this is still more true over a still wider range of affairs.

As the struggle proceeds, suppose the non-violent civilians maintain their discipline and keep cheerful but also keep stating their side of the case earnestly and in all sincerity. Sooner or later the soldiers will talk about it among themselves. The civilians' total absence of retaliation or vindictiveness of even looks or tone of voice contrasts effectively with the harsh or stern commands of their officers. The situation will tell on the nerves of both officers and soldiers. This sort of thing is new to them. They do not know how to treat it. "These civilians seem wholly inoffensive and harmless and honest. What is their crime? Why were we soldiers called out for such a job? We are for war work, but this is peace." Thus they will question in their minds and perhaps among themselves. They will begin to fraternize openly or surreptitiously with the civilians and prisoners, and learn more about the dispute in which they are engaged. It will no longer appear to be a clear-cut case of right vs. wrong, but the opponent's case will appear to have elements of reason.

If the officers forbid them to fraternize with the opponents, the soldiers may think that the order is stupid or that the officers are timid. This would lessen respect for their officers and lower morale.

If there really is solid truth in the position of the non-violent resisters, the soldiers will presently begin to question the validity of their cause. They may become slack in obeying orders. They will see no good to be gained by their being there, and no evil or danger to be averted. "When doubt comes, morale crumbles." ¹² The Duke of Wellington put it even more forcefully; — "No

man with any scruples of conscience is fit to be a soldier." One of the important elements in a soldier's morale is his consciousness of being a protector.¹³ If he is deprived of that, he feels useless and perhaps a little absurd. There is no exhilaration in using violence against non-violent resisters. The soldiers may even feel that the authorities or their officers have morally "let them down" or "sold" them. In such an event, their morale will go quickly.

Meanwhile the situation is unpleasant for the officers, too. If they make any serious mistake, they are apt to lose the respect of the private soldiers as well as of the general public. If they order any shooting there is almost sure to be a wave of public indignation. They know how to fight, but they feel that this situation is "a mess." As Lieut.-Col Andrews says,¹⁴ "Officers naturally dread not duty, with the uncertainties as to how to handle the many delicate situations." While there is no rioting here, the situation is felt to be just as delicate nevertheless, perhaps even more so. Soldiers are trained for action but this encounter is nearly all quiet. Inaction is notoriously hard on a soldier's morale.¹⁵

But someone may object that non-violent resistance is so largely defensive, so passive, that it would be fully as hard on the morale of those using it as on that of the soldiers opposing them. Not so. The conduct of the non-violent resister is not one of mere passive waiting or endurance. Toward his opponent he is not aggressive physically, but his mind and emotions are active, wrestling constantly with the problem of persuading the latter that he is mistaken, seeking proposals as to a better way out, examining his own cause and organization to see what may be its mistakes or short-sightedness, thinking constantly of all possible ways of winning the truth for both sides. And among his own group he is ceaselessly active in strengthening the organization, increasing their unity, perfecting the discipline, enlightening the understanding, helping to remove every possible cause of reproach. He is as busy as any top sergeant of a regiment.

Most private soldiers are bored with monotony and irresponsibility. The conduct of these civilians will be new to them and will elicit their interest and attention all the more because of their previous boredom. It will be a relief and diversion to have something new to think about.

The courage and persistence of the non-violent resisters will call forth the admiration of the soldiers and onlookers or general public. All parties begin to feel that the authorities have chosen the wrong method. They tend to feel that this is a matter for a court or arbitration or discussion. This feeling makes rifts between privates and officers and the higher command or civilian authorities.

If the situation drags on for weeks or months, the officers become even more restive. It is undignified to have to proceed thus against harmless, decent, defenseless people. They begin to feel themselves in a ludicrous position; —unfairly treated. Neither the officers nor the privates can feel that they are protecting anyone or any property.¹⁶ That consciousness tends to lower self-respect.

Perhaps there has been a campaign to make the non-violent resisters seem despicable. They have perhaps been accused of bodily uncleanness, dirt, disorder, illiteracy, ignorance, bad manners, mental and moral degeneracy. They are said to be "beyond the pale," "barbarous," "beneath contempt," etc., etc. We all know that method of bolstering up one's own pride and self-esteem. It is easy to find faults in a stranger, or differences that seem like faults; and a little unconscious Phariseism helps immensely to increase one's morale and salve one's conscience. But the soldiers in immediate contact with the non-violent resisters may find that in fact they are clean, orderly, well disciplined, determined, intelligent, "very decent" in behaviour, and very courageous. It is impossible to be contemptuous of such men. And when respect begins, the instinct for fair play asserts itself. And by that time, morale is not very prominent. That such things can happen even in far more unlikely circumstances is proved

by the fraternizing between the German and Allied troops on the first Christmas of the World War. If at the beginning the non-violent resisters are not very well disciplined, yet faithful to their ideal, their discipline will grow..

Perhaps one of the officers loses his head, or believes in "making an example" and teaching by terror, and orders the soldiers to fire on the unarmed non-violent civil resisters, and many are wounded and killed. The effect is indeed electrical. The immediate beholders may be terror-stricken for a short time. But the news inevitably spreads, and the public indignation against the officer and soldiers will be overpowering. This was the case with the Jallianwala Bagh tragedy in India. The hundreds who died there did more by the manner of their death to lower British self-respect and British prestige in every country, and to further the cause of Indian political freedom than could the deaths of thrice that number in violent rioting or attack upon the army. There have undoubtedly been similar cases of violence by American troops, French troops, troops of any and every nation which likes to consider itself a "trustee" for other nations, tribes or races. A similar instance occurred in the United States in the winter of 1929, when Pennsylvania coal company police killed a miner on strike. Such deeds are not peculiar to any nation but only to a particular purpose and set of beliefs. The point to be emphasized, however, is that non-violent resistance, even in the extreme case where its users are killed, has a far higher probability of weakening the morale of the violent opponents and of promoting the aim sought for than violent resistance would have.

If the Government uses police instead of soldiers, this process of morale destruction will operate somewhat differently. Police are usually drafted from the same district where they work, and so are not apt to be so prejudiced. They are more apt to be married men and so, through their wives, are more open to public opinion. If many new police are drafted their discipline will be weak and they

will be apt to indulge in excesses which will rouse public opinion against the Government as well as themselves.

As we are trying to be realists, let us also see what might happen where the soldiers use poison gas, either of a disabling or lethal kind, or bomb attacks by airplanes. This might not be a frequent occurrence, as the previous non-violence would not be apt to incite such an act from the soldiers. But it has happened. In such an event there would temporarily cease to be direct effective contact between the soldiers and the non-violent resisters. Therefore, the morale of the soldiers would probably not be weakened. But such an attack would add so many sympathizers to the ranks of the non-resisters from among their own people, that a very complete and effective trade boycott and strike of domestic or industrial work could be organized.¹⁷ The economic pressure of such boycotts needs no very direct contact to be effective. Indeed it is evidence of economic and social separation. It is felt tens of thousands of miles away, in the most distant countries, and causes far greater losses to such violent people than any temporary advantage from their terrorism. It lowers their prestige everywhere, and makes such tactics less probable in the future. And the reduction in number of such events gives the non-violent resisters other opportunities to weaken their opponents' morale.

The well-known British military authority, Captain B. H. Liddell-Hart states that,

"In reality it is more fruitful, from the military point of view, to wound than to kill. While the dead man lies still, counting only one man less, the wounded man is a progressive drain upon his side. Comrades are often called upon to bandage him, sometimes even to accompany him to the rear; stretcher-bearers and ambulance drivers to carry him back. Doctors and orderlies must tend him in hospital. And on his passage thither, the sight of him tends to spread depression among the beholders, acting on morale like the drops of cold water which imperceptibly wear away the stone."¹⁸

But this is not true where the wounded are non-violent resisters. The non-violent resister shows a greater unselfishness, a loftier courage, and a deeper conviction than the violent soldier. Therefore the sight of the non-violent wounded creates a purer, wider, more active and more enduring sympathy and unity with their cause than does the sight of wounded soldiers. In non-violent resistance the suffering is itself a weapon or means of winning. Hence, such casualties do not decrease the morale of the non-violent resisters. Similarly, when non-violent resisters are imprisoned they are not thereby "put out of commission" or rendered useless to their cause. Instead, their endurance of hardship increases the general sense of human unity and sympathy for their cause.

Inasmuch as the government of those soldiers in question is seeking to impose its will upon the non-violent resisters, there will necessarily be parleys sooner or later between the non-violent resisters' leaders and the officers of that army or emissaries from that government. Such parleys mean contact, and contact means an opportunity further to convert the opponents, or, in military parlance, to alter their morale.¹⁹ Whenever the violent opponents ask to negotiate, the leaders of the non-violent party will enter into negotiations even though it may seem that by refusing to do so and going on with the struggle the violent opponents may be compelled to yield, and even though the request may be or seem to be a stratagem on the part of the opponents to gain time or to break up the unity of the non-violent party. This willingness to negotiate proves to the violent opponent and to the world that the non-violent resisters are not seeking to humiliate their opponents, and thus paves the way for the conversion of the opponents and for the only kind of a victory worth having. An example of this was Gandhi's negotiations with Viceroy Lord Irwin during the Indian struggle of 1930-31.

It should be remembered that ruthless deeds tend to become known to the world at large and then to lessen the

respect of other nations for the nation indulging in them. A decrease of prestige is not relished by any nation nowadays. The government in question, besides receiving foreign censure, will be severely criticised by its own more decent citizens. They may create very considerable pressure of public opinion against the government and compel it to alter its tactics. It is true that distant civilians who have been blinded by their own pride and long continued propaganda are very often harder to touch than the hostile soldiers on the spot. The arm-chair warriors at home during the World War were unbelievably cruel and hard, and worse in America than in England or France because they were farther away and felt realities less. Yet once their morale gets a little undermined, they crumble rapidly, for they have not been subjected to the discipline of soldiers.

The experienced person will say that such events are always hidden by the censorship of such a government. Sometimes this is so. Acts of the American marines in Haiti and Nicaragua were hidden that way for months. The news of Jallianwala Bagh at Amritsar in India did not reach the United States for eight months after the event. But the tendency is for such news to leak out sooner or later. People of all nationalities go to all parts of the world nowadays. Travel and trade are ubiquitous. Newspaper reporters are always keen for scenting a "story," and as soon as they learn of a censorship anywhere they are still more eager. The modern press services have long stimulated people's curiosity. And if curiosity finds itself balked or thwarted, it will never rest till the story is known. And Western nations are all so jealous of one another that each is eager to learn and publish something discreditable to the others. (I am not trying to criticise, but merely to state facts, — weaknesses among those who are addicted to violence, against which the stronger forces of non-violence will effectively operate.) Any considerable struggle in which one side rigidly sticks to non-violent resistance with any degree of success

makes wonderful news. It is so unusual and dramatic. Newspaper reporters and correspondents have a sense of "news value," and can be trusted to try hard to evade government censorship. The mere knowledge that censorship has been employed arouses doubt in neutral minds of the violent assailant's case. If, in the area where the struggle goes on, the opposing government does not permit the newspapers to publish adequate news of the struggle, the people cease to believe the official statements, and give credence instead to oral rumour or information passed about among themselves.

Of course powerful ruling groups and countries rely chiefly on pride, disdain and disgust to censor the news. They or their supporters vilify these protesting groups or nations, and the general repugnance thereby created acts as a screen against the truth.

"Repugnance, Disgust and Contempt tend to arrest and detain attention on the things which excite them only so long as may be necessary to avoid them. Repugnance, Disgust and Contempt tend to exclude wonder in relation to their objects ... Disgust tends to exclude curiosity about its object and all further knowledge of it, ... Disgust tends to repress pity and all disinterested sorrow on behalf of its object." 20

Many a trade unionist knows the truth of this out of his own hard experience. So also do the Negroes, Chinese and Indians, poor immigrants in the United States, and many others. Intelligent people all over the world should be very much on their guard when they see any disdainful or vilifying newspaper stories, articles or books about any group or nation other than their own, or any statements making subtle invidious comparisons between other people and themselves. Beware of self-flattery! Whether or not such articles or books or accounts were written or told intentionally or innocently, the result is to hide the more important facts and truths in the situation. I do not mean that one should not see all aspects of every situation fully and clearly, but one should merely bear in mind that adverse criticism is dangerous to the person who uses it or absorbs it.

But any oppressed groups anywhere may also be sure that sincere prolonged non-violent resistance on their own part will surely break down barriers and rouse enough curiosity, respect and wonder, to reveal at least a part of the truth and thus effect a more satisfactory adjustment of the conflict.

In non-violent resistance as practised by Gandhi there is another element which serves to weaken censorship. That is his rigid adherence to truth. He has never tolerated secrecy of any sort. He has invited the police to meetings and answered all their questions fully. He has always notified the authorities amply in advance of any action he planned to take which might affect them, and has been frank as to his beliefs and position.^{20a} Examples of this may be found in his campaign in Champaran, his long letter to Viceroy Lord Irwin in March, 1930, and his telegrams to Viceroy Lord Willingdon in December, 1931 and January, 1932. Such a policy gives the public full advance notice of what is likely to take place, and thus makes a subsequent censorship much more difficult to maintain.^{20b} Clean fighting such as this retains every moral advantage of the noblest chivalry.²¹ Secrecy would indicate or seem to indicate fear as well as untruth, or suggest them with the effect of auto-suggestion, and thus would spoil the morale of the resisters and deprive the method of its power.^{21a}

But the non-violent resisters must realize that they cannot decrease the prestige of their opponents or create dissension among their opponents' supporters until they break through the censorship of governments, press associations, or popular disdain; that they cannot break through these censorships until they have conducted themselves with high excellence, discipline, unity, coherence, cleanness and courage so as to compel respect, admiration and wonder. Therefore their chief efforts should be not in talking to reporters or appealing for help from outsiders, but with themselves, to increase their own discipline and organization, their courage and courtesy

and intelligence and cleanness and order. They should strive for such details even as clean bodies, clean clothes, clean houses, clean streets, clean talk. These create self-respect and respect from others. Military discipline is thorough and detailed like this. Non-violent discipline must be the same. Such resisters must realize that if ever they fail in their discipline and fall into violence, untruth, secrecy or disorder, they set back their cause and delay their victory ; and if they do not recover their discipline, they will suffer complete defeat. For these reasons there is need for the utmost energy and determination and persistence and will-power on the part of non-violent resisters, whether they be national groups or labour unions or what not. This discipline, chiefly directed toward themselves, will not arouse outside opposition. They will compel respect when they deserve it and not before. And when they can compel respect they are on the road to upsetting their opponents' morale.

One more policy of ruthlessness must be considered, namely that of starvation. This was used against the Germans with fearful effect in the World War. But it is a weapon that cuts both ways. It not only weakened the Germans greatly during the war but so interfered with their recuperative ability after the "peace" that it reduced the prosperity of the whole world. The Allied bankers and merchants are still suffering from the loss of German purchasing power. Even the militarists are beginning to realize this.²² The great naval nations will hesitate before they try that weapon against a whole nation.

Against smaller groups a government might attempt starvation, but if such groups are really in earnest, have a good cause, and maintain good discipline, their resistance will surely affect public opinion and lower the morale of their opponents. Compare, for instance, the effect of MacSwinney's hunger strike in prison during the Irish struggle for freedom.

Any persons who feel aggrieved by the policies of the ruling groups of either the British Empire or the United States may count on help from the strong desire of the peoples of those countries always to justify their conduct morally, to give it at least a moral tone or appearance.²³ When the Germans invaded Belgium in 1914, Britain and the Allies used this violation of treaty to stiffen their own morale and secure help from neutrals. It enabled them to play the part of chivalrous defenders of the weak.²⁴ It served to cover up many mistakes, faults and evils of the Allies, and kept them all feeling splendidly self-righteous for several years, at least till the secret treaties leaked out. The political effect of this attitude of mind is a desire for and reliance upon prestige, — a superiority-complex which is designed to create an inferiority-complex among other nations or races, and thus make easier the task of dominating.

The maintenance of this prestige requires respect or awe or fear from others. Now if any of these Anglo-Saxon governments or ruling groups engage in harsh violence against a group of truly non-violent resisters, the news surely leaks out sooner or later and lessens the prestige of that ruling group in the eyes of the rest of the world. Also in the eyes of the more honest and intelligent persons in the nation in question. The highly moral attitude and tone of the professions of that government begin to look thin and ludicrous. Dignity and prestige are shaken. There is a weakening of the morale of that governing group. Public opinion today all over the world condemns ruthless violence and cruelty as such, once the cloak of disgust, disdain or fear propaganda has been removed. We are no longer living in the days of Jenghiz Khan or Attila or Nebuchadnezzar. The way in which the world responded to the German attack on Belgium proves this, wholly aside from any question as to the Allies' sincerity in playing on the appeal. Thus the need of those who rely on prestige, for respect from the rest of the world, becomes a weak spot in their armour, the minute they do

an act which does not deserve or actually win respect. The non-violent resisters' weapon of love of truth is directed immediately at this weak spot and pushed home with all courage and fortitude.

We can now see that non-violent resistance "reduces the utility of armaments as instruments of policy," to use de Madariaga's phrase.²⁵ It does so partly in direct and positive manner, proposing and aiding in the creation of new terms of settlement, new roads out of conflict. It also does so by disintegrating the morale of the opponents; — the morale of troops, of commanders, of civil authorities and of their home civilian populations. It acts like the negotiations at Brest-Litovsk to raise opposition at home to the policy of the opposing government. The break-down of the violent opponent's morale is really a change of heart. He does not merely become discouraged about fighting or about his power. He ceases to want in the same way the things he wanted before; ceases to maintain his former attitude toward the resisters; he undergoes a sort of inner conversion. In the case of a very proud and obstinate opponent there might have to be a complete outward defeat before the change of heart really takes place, but such a change is sure to come. In case of industrial strikes, non-violent resistance would tend to raise doubts in the minds of the stockholders of the corporation involved. It tends to lower the prestige of any controlling power or group who are not acting as absolutely sensitive and true servants of the people within their governance.

A military writer states that,

"The principle of demoralization has for its object the destruction of this morale: first, in the moral attack against the spirit and nerves of the enemy's nation and government; secondly, against this nation's policy; thirdly, against the plan of its commander-in-chief; and fourthly, against the morale of the soldiers commanded by him. Hitherto, the fourth, the least important of these objectives, has been considered by the traditionally-minded soldier as the sole psychological objective of this great principle. In the last great war the result of this was —

that the attack on the remaining three only slowly evolved during days of stress and because of a faulty appreciation of this principle during peace time." 26

Non-violent resistance operates to lower all these different kinds of morale, and it may be effectively aided by economic boycotts or in some extreme instances perhaps by non-payment of taxes.

We see, therefore, that non-violent resistance is not wholly unlike the principles of military demoralization. It is merely a step further in the logic, and in military history.

Besides decreasing the opponent's morale, mass non-violent resistance does much to enhance the morale and unity of those who use it. We have noted the unifying effect of the sight of voluntary suffering. This operates not only upon the resisters themselves but also, by sympathy, upon all beholders who hitherto may have been neutral. This happened in India in 1930 and is now happening there again. The sincerity and earnestness of the sufferers, if the suffering continues long, convinces many others and wins them over to support the cause. The sight of leaders themselves enduring hardships, insults and wounds, going to jail, sacrificing their fortunes and lives for their cause is far more potent to produce increase of numbers, unity, enthusiasm, devotion and increase of effort than the sight, in violent war, of generals and politicians dwelling in comfort and safety and telling others what to do and how to fight. "The blood of the martyrs was the seed of the Church," and the same result comes in any situation where non-violent methods are steadily used.

In situations where there is such rigid government censorship that little news of the oppression and violence of soldiers and police against the non-violent resisters gets to the outside world, this unifying effect and winning of sympathy from neutral or timid onlookers is very important. The example of steady, long-continued non-violent resistance creates within the censored area a public

opinion that compels aid from all sorts of men who may have been entirely and strongly opposed to the resisters. Intellectual reasons for not joining the group crumble away, sometimes slowly, sometimes quickly. The feelings engendered by the prolonged sight of non-violent suffering for a cause ends differences of mind and also of feeling.

If it is a national struggle or among a large number of people containing many diverse elements separated by old social fissures or badly disturbed by the recent impact of a different culture, it may take many months for the unifying effect of non-violent resistance and its search for social truth to go far enough to bring success. Nevertheless, the process is sure and, if the method is faithfully adhered to, the result certain.

It may be that while the resisters are in jail, some of the conservative, selfish or comfort-loving members of their general group engage in "politics" and palaver with the opponents. As that sort of thing goes on, perhaps for months, the contrast between them and those who are suffering jail terms and hardships grows so glaring that more and more people turn away in disgust and mistrust from the politicians and pin their faith on those who are in jail. The politicians sense this loss of their prestige and are in turn compelled to follow the crowd and cease co-operating with the opponents.

This unifying power of non-violent resistance may often take effect more rapidly than does the breaking down of the morale of the opponents. It is also a factor in that loss of morale. As time goes on, the access of numbers and strength and unity in the group of non-violent resisters begins to impress the violent opponents, to fill them with misgivings, and thus to injure their morale still further. Strength compels respect, and in this case the respect is for moral qualities as well as for numbers or political power.

War also acts to unify nations engaged in it. But the unity engendered by non-violent resistance is deeper, more

closely knit and more permanent than that produced by war, for reasons already discussed.

If, as often happens,²⁷ the group or nation which is using non-violent resistance has been under political, economic or social subjection for many years and has therefore lost much self-confidence, self-reliance and self-respect, and suffers from what the psychologists call an "inferiority complex," this new method of struggle tends to put an end to that weakness. The contrast between the brutal deeds of the exasperated violent party and the non-violent sufferings of the resisters is so startling as to produce in the ranks of the resisters a feeling of immense moral superiority. Presently the rage of the violent party leads them to make false statements or commit various stupidities which make the resisters realize that their superiority is intellectual as well as moral. This intellectual contrast grows still more marked if the resisters adhere faithfully to truth in all their words as well as actions. If the stimulus of these contrasts is continued long enough, the inferiority-complex of the resisters' group vanishes and their self-respect, self-confidence and self-reliance steadily increase. Thus another element of their former disadvantage is done away with. Students of psychology have now learned what the guiding minds of the ruling classes have known for centuries, — that an inferiority complex firmly created in childhood and judiciously maintained by regular stimulus through the period of development, is the most potent of all methods to restrain independent creative action among individuals and masses of people. It makes them feel utterly helpless and deprives them of hope, imagination or will even to try to struggle, and in times of crisis it creates a fatal hesitation and lack of confidence. Hence this creative power of non-violent resistance, putting an end to inferiority complexes, makes it a very important weapon for oppressed nations, classes and groups everywhere.

Another reason why mass non-violent resistance is effective is because in course of time it wins for its users

the support of public opinion just as in the case of its individual use. It is well known that the gaining of public opinion is one of the principal objects of war.²⁸ That was the object of all the propaganda in the World War. The immensely greater part that propaganda played then in comparison with previous wars shows the increasing importance of public opinion in large conflicts.²⁹

Victories in war are imposing and terrifying, but the alliances and co-operations gained thereby are notoriously unstable. Such allies come more because it seems expedient than because they really want to. A victory by non-violent resistance does not carry with it a further latent threat to harm anyone. It carries conviction of sincerity and friendship, whereas a victory through violence always has in it at least a suspicion of selfishness and possible further aggrandizement. In quality a victory by non-violent resistance is far more gallant and joyous than one by violence can ever be. It requires no lying or distortion or suppression of the truth, no slaughter or threats. It leaves no bad conscience or bad taste in the mouth. The public opinion it gains is weighty and lasting.

Still another way in which mass non-violent resistance operates is to end and clear away social defects, economic mistakes and political errors. The semi-military discipline of the resisters, the getting rid of bad habits, the learning to struggle without anger, the social unity developed, the emphasis on moral factors, the appeal to the finest spirit of the opponents and onlookers, the generosity and kindness required,—all these constitute a social purification, a creation of truer values and actions among all concerned. If the struggle involves many people and lasts a long time, the discussion of the issues becomes so widespread and intense and detailed that much that was previously hidden or misunderstood is revealed and made clear to all. It is a period of great public education. The nature of the struggle and its prolongation bring into unmistakable action the real purpose of the two parties,

and show a great many of the implications of their respective aims and attitudes not previously seen or understood. The struggle tests the sincerity of both parties. It corrects errors among the violent party, too. This evolution of more social truth is a gain to both sides. Like war, non-violent resistance is a method of deciding great public questions, and this clearing away of errors is an essential part of the settlement of such great disputes. "The truth shall make you free" is no mere sentiment. When truth is more nearly approximated in action there is a tremendous gain in strength as well as a liberation. Although a long war also clears away some social, economic and political errors, it is not very effective for this purpose because the angers and hatreds of war tend strongly to becloud the truth, as was clearly shown by the propaganda of the World War.

Possibly to some readers this whole chapter may seem to be a structure of untried theory. Who in this actual world of hard realities does or ever would for an instant fear this so-called weapon of non-violent resistance?

The answer is known to every student of history, every detective, secret-service man or C.I.D. officer, every really "hard-boiled" ruthless executive of an American industrial corporation which has had a strike of employees, every American trade union leader, every leader of a subject people striving for political freedom. The answer is that every "blood and iron" type of governor fears non-violent resistance so much that he secretly hires so-called "agents provocateurs" who go among the non-violent resisters pretending to be of them, and invite them to deeds of violence or actually throw bombs or do deeds of violence themselves.³⁰ This was the method of the old Russian government under Tsardom. The rulers in power immediately make great outcry, stir up public indignation against the "miscreants", call out the police or soldiery, and "repress the uprising" with considerable brutality, meanwhile assuring the world that these are stern but necessary steps taken only in the interests of public safety,

law and order. Those striving for freedom or more privileges are indeed often violent in the first instance. But if they are not violent, their opponents or the underlings of their opponents frequently stir up violence in order to take advantage of the public reaction against it. That they feel they need to adopt such tactics shows how much they fear non-violent resistance.

Non-violent resisters must face this fact without anger or bitterness. It is simply one item in the whole situation with which they have to contend. Their defense is to build up a thorough discipline of non-violence in feeling, thought, word, and deed amongst every one of their members. They must see the whole meaning of what they are trying to do. They are trying to discipline and control the emotion of anger and the instinct of pugnacity in the same way and to the same extent that military discipline controls the emotion of fear and the instinct of flight. Therefore under this new discipline, violent words and actions directed against the opponent or his interests are to be made as traitorous to the cause as running away is in the army. Anger is to become as disgraceful and socially reprehensible as cowardice is now among school-boys or soldiers.

Once that understanding and attitude and discipline are attained among the group of non-violent resisters, any agent provocateur who comes whispering among them or preaching violence, retaliation or revenge will be immediately known for what he is, and repudiated. And the group will soon prove its tactics so clearly to the public that the latter will not be deceived by the act of an agent provocateur bomb thrower or inflammatory speaker.

"But," says the shrewd critic, "even if we grant the efficiency of this new weapon provided it could once get under way; would it not quickly be rendered impossible merely by imprisonment or deportation for life of the few leaders who understand it and see its possibilities?" The answer again is, No. The idea has already gone too far. New leaders would spring up as fast as you arrest the old

ones. Further, nowadays you cannot go on indefinitely arresting large numbers of quiet, steady, industrious, gentle people for nothing. Non-violence is decency to the nth power. Governments, after all, have to make some appearance of existing for the welfare of their peoples. Wholesale arrests for the practice of virtue cannot continue very long. The example of those few leaders is so striking that their execution or life imprisonment would be dangerous to governments and government prestige.

It may be urged that non-violent resistance would fail if attempted against armies of certain nations with a reputation of ruthlessness and callous brutality. Undoubtedly in such a case there would be losses, and perhaps heavy ones. The history of Cromwell's conquest of Ireland, and the record of the laws and punishments of those days show clearly that the English in that century were fearfully brutal and callous, yet the non-violent resistance of the Quakers prevailed against them. But even barbarians respect courage, and are perhaps more easily subject to wonder and awe in the face of extraordinary events than are the more sophisticated or more highly organized nations.³¹ Non-violent resistance touches human nature itself, not merely its cultured areas. The psychological forces in non-violent resistance would operate in different ways against different nations, but they will operate effectively against them all, as surely as violent war has operated against them all.

CHAPTER VII

AN EFFECTIVE SUBSTITUTE FOR WAR

Despite the horrors, futilities and destructiveness of war there are nevertheless certain virtues and truths associated with it which humanity cannot afford to lose. In any discussion of new methods of settling conflicts, these military virtues cannot be disregarded.

The romance of war is an undoubted fact, especially for those who have never taken part in modern war. There is in all hearts a desire to live a significant life, to serve a great idea and sacrifice oneself for a noble cause, to feel the thrill of spiritual unity with one's fellows and to act in accordance therewith. We all wish for strenuous action and the exercise of courage and fortitude, to be carried away by the enthusiasm of daring. We all love to undergo a common discipline and hardship for the sake of a fine ideal; to be in good effective order; to be strong, generous and self-reliant; to be physically fit, — with body, mind and soul harmoniously working together for a great purpose, — thus becoming a channel of immense energies. Under such conditions the whole personality would be alert, conscious, unified, and living profoundly, richly and exaltedly. Then one could be truly and gloriously happy. Martial music suggests many of these elements and their consequent exhilaration and exaltation.

Probably war and conflict seem to promise such results partly because our ordinary life of alleged peace is so often dull, trivial, monotonous and devoid of fine purpose. It is so full of frustration, balked disposition, hidden violence, oppression and meanness; so insipid, empty, fragmentary, full of cross-purposes and evil.

"Such a hopeless snarl. Anything to be relieved of such a mess." So cries the heart. Yet what a risk, to wrench ourselves from established life.

One reason why we take such deep delight in risk attending the search for this release is that such adventures turn possibilities into accomplished facts. They are modes of creation, of "free activity of the soul", as von Clausewitz says. Hence, after men have long been chained to an industrial routine, feeling themselves helpless cogs in a vast machine, the call of an immeasurable risk cannot easily be resisted. But violence and war are attractive not merely for their romance; they also have solid elements of truth and virtue.

The most outstanding virtue of violence is that of courage. But violence is not the only occasion or test or proof of courage.

Another virtue is energy. All the deep emotions, especially fear and anger, are generators of tremendous energy. To be a channel of immense energy gives one a thrill and a satisfaction that can never be forgotten. Fear, anger and hatred are doubtless evil, but the energy that they arouse is, by itself, good; for as William Blake said, energy is divine.

Furthermore, the sincerity of fighters and warriors is admirable. They live and work, sacrifice and die for their vision of the truth, even though they may be too inarticulate to express it in words. The militarist's vision of truth may be partial and cloudy, but nevertheless he lives, suffers and dies for the truth as he sees it. He may even be inspired by hatred, anger, and revenge, and may put his whole faith in material weapons, but he is true to himself and the faith that is in him. That much is fine and solid.

Another virtue of the militarists which deserves our admiration is discipline. Discipline establishes and maintains effective habits, creates solidarity and reliability, promotes self-respect and respect from others.¹

The militarist is right when he says that conflict is an inevitable part of life. This world is inherently diverse and changing; and since human beings differ so much in

the values they hold, in environment, inheritance, intelligence, tolerance, and unselfishness, and are so bound by tradition and habit, the adjustments involved in change and growth necessarily result in conflicts. No strong or sensible person would want to abolish growth or change or the positive achievements that often issue from struggle. Struggle is a part of the very meaning of life.

These, then, seem to be the important virtues of the violent fighter, — enterprise, courage, strenuous action, and endurance ; sincerity, devotion, and a sense of unity with one's own kind ; order, training and discipline. His truth that conflict is inevitable is another element of his strength.

Our examination of the processes of non-violent resistance enables us now to realize that all these virtues and truths of war are given full scope and exercise in this new method of settling great disputes. If any nation or group adopts mass non-violent resistance, there will be no moral losses resulting.

Mr. Walter Lippmann, in an excellent article on "The Political Equivalent of War,"² quotes from William James' essay on "A Moral Equivalent for War," and continues :

"It is not sufficient to propose an equivalent for the military virtues. It is even more important to work out an equivalent for the military methods and objectives. For the institution of war is not merely an expression of the military spirit. It is not a mere release of certain subjective impulses clamouring for expression. It is also—and, I think, primarily—one of the ways by which great human decisions are made. If that is true, then the abolition of war depends primarily upon inventing and organizing other ways of deciding those issues which hitherto have been decided by war....

"Any real programme of peace must rest on the premise that there will be causes of dispute as long as we can foresee, and that those disputes have to be decided, and that a way of deciding them must be found which is not war."

"A way of deciding them which is not war." Is that way non-violent resistance? Closer examination shows that it satisfies Mr. Lippmann's requirements. Non-violent

resistance not only utilizes the military virtues, it uses also on a moral plane many of the military methods and principles, it employs many of the same psychological processes, and even retains some of the military objectives, with moral modifications. Military men know much about human nature, but non-violent resisters know still more. If war has been in the past a practical method of making great human decisions, of settling great disputes, this new method will be still more effective for such a purpose.

The very principles of military strategy operate in this new mode of struggle.

Von Clausewitz's principles of war have been summarized,³ as follows :

"Retaining the initiative, using the defensive as the decisive form of action, concentration of force at the decisive point, the determination of that point, the superiority of the moral factor to purely material resources, the proper relation between attack and defense, and the will to victory."

Other authorities state them somewhat differently ; Foch, for instance, laying more stress on the offensive.⁴

We have seen that the non-violent resister begins an entirely new line of conduct. He seizes and maintains the moral initiative. He uses the principle of surprise most effectively.⁵ Von Clausewitz said ; " Surprise plays a much greater part in strategy than in tactics ; it is the most powerful element of victory," and a long line of military authorities agree.⁶

The surprise of non-violent resistance is effective partly because it is startling and partly because the opponent is so bound by his violent habits that he is ill-prepared to utilize the new tactics himself. He is like a wrestler using European methods pitted against a Japanese using jiu-jitsu. The surprise of non-violent resistance, unlike that of war, is not due to deceit or stratagem but simply to its novelty and daring.

Napoleon stated,⁷

"It is an approved maxim in war, never to do what the enemy wishes you to do, for this reason alone, that he desires it. A field of battle, therefore, which he has previously studied

and reconnoitred, should be avoided, and double care should be taken where he has had time to fortify and entrench. One consequence deducible from this principle is, never to attack a position in front which you can gain by turning."

Non-violent resistance acts fully in accord with Napoléon's principle. Your violent opponent wants you to fight in the way to which he is accustomed. If you utterly decline, and adopt a method wholly new to him, you have thereby gained an immediate tactical advantage.

In "using the defensive as the decisive form of action," the peaceful resister in his external actions agrees with von Clausewitz, but in respect to his psychological energies he agrees with Foch; he is constantly "attacking," that is, energetically seeking the psychological road for a truly satisfactory solution of the conflict. His energy is not used so much in opposition as in trying to open new and adequate and wise channels for the energies of both his opponents and himself to unite in and flow on together, and in removing defects from his own position. Non-violent resistance is not directed against the *energy* of the opponent's desires but merely against their immediate direction, form or method. It seeks to discover for him a new and wiser channel for his energy.

Yet this does not mean reducing the conflict to a tame debating society. Although sometimes a safe and easy issue of the conflict may be found, the non-violent resister may feel assured of a fair probability that he will sooner or later have to suffer hardships, and perhaps wounds, imprisonment and even death. If the struggle is against a powerful group or corporation or a government, and is prolonged, the resisters may have to suffer horrible tortures and bestial treatment. "War is hell," and in a big long struggle soldiers and police abandon all restraints. We assume that the peaceful resister is really in earnest, really believes in his cause, is ready to sacrifice for it, and is no more a coward than any soldier is. He must take risks. This is a real adventure, — no parlour make-believe for pretenders or boasters.

But non-violent resistance differs in one psychological respect from war. The object is not to make the opponent believe that he is crushed and beaten and humiliated, but to persuade him to realize that he can attain security, or whatever else his ultimate desire may be by easier and surer means than he saw formerly. The effort is furthermore to help him work out such new means, not rigidly or on any a priori plan, but flexibly in accordance with the deepest growing truth of the entire situation in all its bearings. The opponent's courage is not destroyed, but merely his belief that his will and desire must be satisfied only in his way is altered, and he is led to see the situation in a broader, more fundamental and far-sighted way, so as to work out a solution which will satisfy or more nearly satisfy both parties.

Does the non-violent resister, "concentrate his force at the decisive point," and is he active in "the determination of that point?" He certainly is. He decides, with Marshal de Saxe, that "The secret of victory lies in the hearts of human beings,"⁸ that is, that it is a matter of psychology. Therefore he concentrates upon the psychological forces in the situation, and deals with them as efficiently and powerfully as he possibly can. And in so far as concentration means bringing strength to bear against weakness, he does that also, for in this moral or psychological field he is far stronger and better prepared than his opponent.

We need not dilate further upon the belief and action of the non-violent resister, in respect to the principle of the "superiority of the moral factor to purely material resources." He acts more sincerely upon that principle than did any soldier ever yet born.

"The proper relation between attack and defense" has been very searchingly considered by the peaceful resister.⁹ He knows that the best relation of all between these two energies is not one of opposition but of resolution, integration and sublimation. He thus enables both sides to win, and conquers both his own possible short-

sightedness of aim and that of his enemy at the same time. The result is not a triumphant victor on the one side and a despondent, repressed vanquished on the other. Both sides are happy in the joint victory of their more important selves and the common defeat of their mistakes.

Does the peaceful resister have the "will to conquer" which Foch calls "the first condition of victory?"¹⁰ He surely does. Indeed, he must have an indomitable will to victory in order to endure the suffering put upon him. Moreover, he has a stronger incentive to win than has the ordinary soldier in war, for by this new way the final result is *sure* and settled permanently, and with a great release of energy and happiness for all concerned. No aftermath of resentment, hatred, bitterness, or revenge. No necessity for further threats or force.

There are other principles of strategy which also find parallels here, — such principles as those of the economy of forces, the importance of information, security, mobility, endurance, etc. — but we need not discuss all these. The similarities to the principles of military strategy are clear.

But the similarities between war and non-violent resistance are not merely an interesting set of analogies. This entire chapter to this point answers two doubts, — namely whether this method of struggle is not utterly foreign and new and suited only to Oriental peoples, and therefore whether it could be adopted by people with the modern Western attitude of mind. The facts that the military virtues are used and needed in this new form of struggle, and that the principles of military strategy apply here too, show that if we adopt this new mode of settling conflicts we will not be entirely reversing our previous experience, we will not be abandoning the true principles and values that the human race has garnered from its age-long experience of war. It may be that for its first great mass success non-violent resistance had to be used among a people who have much social awareness and who had been thoroughly inculcated and disciplined for many centuries with ideas of non-violence, as the Indians

with their Buddhist, Jain, and Hindu tradition have been. But after its first success, a desire to use it will arise in other countries, and its rationale will come to be understood. Given desire and understanding, the courage, organizing ability, and disciplinary capacity of Western peoples is not less than that of Indians. Hence the use of the method may be expected to spread. The new method is an advance, an improvement in the art of deciding public disputes, but not so utterly foreign as to be unworkable by Western peoples. By fully understanding these relationships between war and non-violent resistance we may provide ourselves an assurance with which we may advance to this new procedure.

In cases where Asiatics have tried to relieve themselves of the economic and military pressure of European domination they have complained that the West cannot understand any language but that of force. If that is true, it means that the West will be utterly unprepared and helpless in the face of well-disciplined, thoroughly organized and wisely led non-violent resistance, especially if it is accompanied by an equally thorough temporary non-vindictive economic boycott. The strategic principle of surprise would operate most dramatically and effectively. To use non-violent resistance against the West would be complying with Napoleon's Sixteenth Maxim of War quoted above. But I am inclined to think that the West will come to understand the new language fairly soon, once it is shown to be strong language. The quotation from Sir George Lloyd referred to in the previous chapter seems to indicate a partial understanding of the new language, and considerable worry to boot. The West is in this respect something like a baby who begins to understand what words mean before he can say any of them himself. And there can be no doubt that the West understands the language of economic boycott and decreasing profits reasonably well. No doubt the West is reluctant to alter its ways, but that is a different matter. To the extent that the West does come to understand the new language more

deeply, its advance will make settlements and readjustments quicker and easier.

If in some future conflict both sides should use non-violent resistance, that side would win which most deeply understands and is best disciplined and prepared in this new method. That would be the side which achieved the most self-purification, which attained the most social truth and showed the finest love. It would thereby attain the greater inner unity and strength, the greater respect from its opponents and the public.

In summary, we see that non-violent resistance resembles war :

(1) in having a psychological and moral aim and effect ;

(2) in being a discipline of a parallel emotion and instinct ;

(3) in operating against the morale of the opponents ;

(4) in principles of strategy ;

(5) in being a method of settling great disputes and conflicts ;

(6) in requiring courage, dynamic energy, capacity to endure fatigue and suffering, self-sacrifice, self-control, chivalry, action ;

(7) in being positive and powerful ;

(8) in affording opportunity of service for a large idea, and for glory.

It does not avoid hardships, suffering, wounds or even death. In using it men and women may still risk their lives and fortunes and sacrifice all. Nevertheless the possibilities of casualties and death are greatly reduced under it, and they are all suffered voluntarily and not imposed by the non-violent resisters.

It is more efficient than war because it costs far less in money as well as in lives and suffering. Also usually it permits a large part of the agricultural and industrial work of the people to go on, and hence the life of the country can be maintained during the struggle.

It is again more efficient than war because "the legitimate object of war is a more perfect peace." If the peace after the war is to be better than that which preceded it, the psychological processes of the conflict must be such as will create a more perfect peace. You can't climb a mountain by constantly going down hill. Mutual violence inevitably breeds hatred, revenge and bitterness, — a poor foundation for a more perfect peace. The method of non-violent resistance, where there really is resistance, so as to bring all the issues out into the open, and a really new settlement worked out as nearly as possible in accord with the full truth of the issues at stake, — this method does not leave a sense of frustration and will bring a more perfect peace.

Considering the completeness of its effects, non-violent resistance, is as quick and probably quicker than war by violence. It is a weapon that can be used equally well by small or large nations, small or large groups, by the economically weak and by the apparently strong, and even by individuals. It compels both sides and neutrals to seek the truth, whereas war blinds both sides and neutrals to the truth.

As we have already seen and will show further, non-violent resistance certainly produces less ill-effect, if any, than does violent war, and this decrease of ill-effects applies to the users of non-violence, to the opposing side, and to society and the world at large.

May we not then fairly describe non-violent resistance as an effective substitute for war?

It is realistic in that it does not eliminate or attempt to eliminate possibilities of conflict and differences of interest, and includes *all* factors in the situation both material and imponderable, physical and psychological.^{10a}

It does not require any nation to surrender any part of its real sovereignty or right of decision, as a real league of nations might. It does not surrender the right of self-defence, although it radically alters the nature of the defence. It requires no expensive weapons or armament, .

no drill grounds or secrecy. It does not demoralize those who take part in it, but leaves them finer men and women than when the struggle began.

Moreover, the method does not require the machinery of a government or a large wealthy organization. It may be practised and skill may be acquired in it in every situation of life, at home and abroad, by men and women of any and all races, nations, tribes, groups, classes, or castes, young and old, rich and poor. That women take part in it is important. Indeed, they are more effective in it than most men.

Inasmuch as some of the elements involved are essentially the same as trust, they have the same energizing effect as financial credit, only more so. Thus it stimulates and mobilizes, during the conflict and for a long time thereafter, all the idealism and energy of all groups and parties.

It is much superior to William James' detailed suggestions in his essay on "A Moral Equivalent for War", in that it does not require State organization, direction or assistance; it is not used against the exterior forces and conditions of Nature but against human wrongs and evils. It is therefore much more dramatic and interesting and alluring, both for young men and old, and women, too. It has even more possibilities of high daring, adventure, risk, bravery, endurance, and truly fine and noble romance than any of the chivalrous violent fighting of by-gone ages.

May we not therefore say of it in the words which Marshal Foch used in reference to a different occasion: "The new kind of war has begun, the hearts of soldiers have become a new weapon." ¹¹

CHAPTER VIII

NON-VIOLENCE AND THE STATE

Non-violent resistance is the key to the problem of liberty in the modern State. That seems like a large claim until we begin to reflect upon the part which force and compulsion play in all the relationships in which the State takes part.

All observers recognize that compulsion, intimidation and violence have been and still are a very large and perhaps predominating element in the State, and especially in political government.¹ If anyone felt inclined to dispute the scholars on this point, let him examine the figures showing that the expenditures for past and future wars form a very high percentage of the total expenditures of the governments of the majority of nations. To this he should add the State expenditures for prisons, the administration of criminal law and a certain part of the administration of civil law. The State has many fine elements, but they perhaps do not counterbalance the large part played by force and compulsion.

This condition of affairs is due not to a particular ruling class, as the Socialists and Communists would have us believe, but to an inner psychological attitude which prevails through all groups and classes in the so-called "civilized" world. The Marxians say that political forms and methods are determined entirely by economic forces. We would say that both political and economic processes, at least in relation to violence and coercion, are due to still deeper psychological factors. The amount of coercion and violence in the State is a reflection or resultant of a similar tendency and attitude in all our life and activities, both individual and associative.

The non-violent resister believes that a large part of the activities of the State are founded upon a mistake,

namely, the idea that fear is the strongest and best sanction for group action and association. He believes that fear is divisive and therefore cannot be the foundation for permanent unity and strength.² He believes that in the family and in education it has now been realized that fear is not a sound basis for action. There we find substituted the more positive and growth-stimulating forces of intellectual curiosity, wonder, love and co-operation. The non-violent resister looks forward to a time when a similar realization will come in regard to the larger associations of States. He believes that non-violent resistance will probably be an important means in reaching this realization.

Because of the importance of the factor of compulsion in the State, it will be desirable to examine a number of relationships between the State and other groups or elements, in which violence or non-violence may play a part. We will consider them as follows :

A. Relations with ordinary rivals or opponents of the State, —namely, other States and criminals.

B. Relations with unusual opponents, —conscientious objectors to war and non-violent resisters against some particular law or against the State itself.

The principles of non-violent resistance can be applied to diplomacy as well as war, for the two are closely allied.³ Compared with war, non-violent resistance is a safer and more effective instrument of policy. By its use the entire military and naval expenses of all nations can be eliminated.⁴

In so far as diplomacy has been characterized by secrecy and deceit, the principle of truth involved in non-violent resistance will bring about reform. Secrecy and deceit are signs of fear, but non-violent resistance proceeds upon the basis of control and eventual elimination of fear. It insists on truth and openness in all dealings. Gandhi's practice is a living embodiment of this principle.

Non-violent resistance can be used internationally, with or without economic boycott as circumstances require. Causes that some people think cannot be submitted

to arbitration may be handled by such means. Mere non-violence will not do, as the example of China, in the past, shows. There must be constructive resistance. The Indian Non-Co-operative Movement in 1922 gave an example which was promising.

Attempts to improve international relations absorb the time, energy and money of many people. While I admire the devotion shown, most of it seems to me to be wasted because it deals with symptoms instead of the root of the trouble. It is like putting poultices on a cancer. War is an institution, and institutions are external expressions of previous inner attitudes and ways of thinking.⁵ To try merely to alter the institution is like locking the barn door after the horse is stolen. Even the Mosaic commandment "Thou shalt not kill" begins psychologically at the wrong end of the problem.

World courts, leagues of nations, peace pacts and peace congresses do little toward improving the inner attitudes or psychological dispositions and habits of mind. Most of the peacemakers work only on externals, and disregard deep seated inconsistencies and forces working for war in many parts of the economic, social, educational and organized religious systems.⁶ To say this is not to oppose their effort, but only to wish that it might be more efficient.

Inasmuch as peacemakers need to be especially sensitive to the truth, it seems desirable to present here two criticisms of their activity, for them to ponder. One was well phrased by Niebuhr :

"...The implication is that England and America are the only two really solvent nations in the Western World, and that, since they have what they want and need, it is to their interest to preach peace. The hungry nations will meanwhile fail to react to this moral idealism. They will shrewdly and cynically observe that it is always the tendency of those who have to extol the virtue of peace and order and to place those who have not at a moral disadvantage.

"It is quite impossible for the strong to be redemptive in their relation to the weak if they are not willing to share the

weakness of the weak, or at least to equalize in some degree the disproportion of advantages."7

Another incisive criticism is made by Trotsky in respect to a certain sort of pacifism.⁸ He says that "a responsible function is allotted to pacifism in the economy of warfare." By this he refers to the pacifists who go around talking about "our sacred duty to do all in our power to preserve the nation from the horrors of war," yet always carefully adding, "If war should come, we will all support the government, of course." Trotsky proceeds:

"To do everything in our power against the war,' means to afford the voice of popular indignation an outlet in the form of harmless demonstration, after having previously given the government a guarantee that it will meet with no serious opposition in the case of war, from the pacifist faction.

"Official pacifism could have desired nothing better. It could now give satisfactory assurance of imperialistic 'preparedness'. After Bryan's own declaration, only one thing was necessary to dispose of his noisy opposition to war, and that was, simply, to declare war. And Bryan rolled right over into the government camps. And not only the *petite bourgeoisie*, but also the broad masses of the workers, said to themselves: 'If our government, with such an outspoken pacifist as Wilson at the head, declares war, and if even Bryan supports the government in the war, it must be an unavoidable and righteous war.'"

It is easy to see how that type of pacifism helps to rally the entire country to the support of militarists at the time they most need it. They are glad to let such pacifists throw a gentle moral glow over affairs before war and then fill themselves and the masses with moral fervour in support of war as soon as it comes.⁹

International peace requires a development of a world community.¹⁰ The mood of mutual tolerance, respect and good will needed for the establishment and operation of such a community will best be created, in social practice, by the use of non-violent resistance for the righting of existing wrongs.

One weakness of most peace proposals is that they all expect the action to be taken by governments or large

organizations, or at least someone else besides the proposer. The advantage of non-violent resistance is that it begins at home and can and needs to be practised in all the small private relations between people as a preparation for and accompaniment of its use on a large scale. Nobody can dodge the responsibility for its success. The poorest and most insignificant can practise it as finely, successfully and usefully as prime ministers, presidents, financiers, labour leaders or other powerful persons. Through non-violent resistance we can reach an active, reasoned belief in peace which is capable of continuous practice in all grades of life and all sorts of conflict, so as to educate everyone into a conviction that it gives better results, more efficiently, than violence.

The causes of disagreement and conflict between nations are legion, and need not be discussed here. Yet there is one group of causes so very important at present that it may not be out of place to consider it briefly. This is the economic and political relationship between nations of the temperate zone and those of the tropics, together with the international jealousies resulting therefrom between nations of the former group. It is recognized now in Europe and America that diversified farming creates economic prosperity and stability for the farmer and reduces the likelihood of plant disease, insect pests, market gluts, and other risks. It also increases the yield per acre. Yet at the same time Europe and the United States are asking and compelling the tropics to develop large plantations and single crop agriculture, to raise in this way rubber, jute, cotton, hemp, sugar, tobacco, tea, coffee, rice, oil seeds, cocoanuts, bananas, oranges, pineapples, etc. By this "mining" of the land the white man is passing a heavy burden onto the tropics, reducing their prosperity, depleting their soil, ultimately decreasing their productivity, increasing their losses from plant disease and insects, and market depressions.¹¹ In the long run it has decreased and will decrease the purchasing power of the tropical

markets for manufactured goods. Tropical peoples will be apt to try to get rid of the incubus.'

Some observers say that the present civilization and culture of the temperate zones is now largely based on tropical products, such as rubber, cotton, jute, vegetable oils, coffee, tea, tobacco, spices, etc., and that the tropics must do their share of maintaining the other civilizations. Other observers point to the restless energy of inhabitants of the temperate zones and the relative lethargy of tropical peoples, and do not see, therefore, how exploitation of the tropics could be prevented even if it were desirable on other grounds. Still others believe that industrial nations ought to exploit the tropics in order to spread the economic blessings of industrialism over all the human race.

All these beliefs proceed on a denial of choice or preference to the tropical peoples, and are therefore a form of violence. Hitherto those peoples have lacked an effective way to express their preferences, but they are beginning to learn the use of the economic boycott and more advanced forms of non-violent resistance. It is all very well to talk of the economic interdependence of the different nations, but to use that as a high-sounding excuse for the sort of exploitation that is now going on will not do. International trade is excellent, but every nation ought to do its utmost first to produce its own essential food and clothing,—the bare necessities of its life as a nation. That policy is not now followed by the controlling financial, industrial and political groups of any nation in the Western world, though perhaps Denmark and one or two other small European countries are not far from it. A large amount of self-dependence for the essential necessities of national life is the economic basis of national self-respect, mutual international respect and a preventive of economic parasitism. Beyond and above that let trade proceed as merrily as it can, but with a minimum of exploitation. And let each nation and each group within the nation use non-violent resistance to keep

its own minimum low and to educate the holders of power to make social use of it, and to keep them in that path.

Many of the wrong relations between nations come from wrong relations between groups within them. For example, the dependence of Great Britain upon food from abroad, and consequently part of her imperialism, seems to have been partly a result of the policy of enclosures beginning about 1400 whereby the poor English farmers were dispossessed of their lands for the benefit of the more powerful classes.¹² In so far as this general principle is valid, the improvement of relations between the State and groups within it would seem to be one means of helping toward sound international relationships.

Let us now consider the internal relationships of the State.

In all nations there seems to be a ruling group or class. For example, in England it is the aristocracy,¹³ in Russia it is the Communist Party, in the United States, it is "big business". These groups know the art of government, different in outer form in different countries, but having many psychological similarities in all. Up till now the art of government has been largely the art of producing and manipulating prides, fears, jealousies, angers, resentments and divisions among groups and powerful individuals so as always to keep the control of power within one predominant group. Consider how subtle and powerful is the manipulation of social pride and vanity by the ranks, titles, orders, official rewards, and superiority and inferiority complexes, in the British aristocracy. Germany formerly showed a similar spectacle. Other nations use the same methods in lesser degree. Much political control is based on the principle of "divide and rule". These processes involve much fraud and deceit.

Non-violent resistance is built on principles the opposite of all this and its practice will purify politics and government.

The group within each State toward which the State uses compulsory force most constantly is that of the criminals. It is therefore interesting to find that the attitude and methods of non-violent resistance are the conclusions toward which all the experience of penology and the investigations of psychiatrists, criminologists and social reformers are steadily tending.¹⁴

If there is ever any reform after forceful punishment or imprisonment, it is not the force or even the suffering that works the change. That depends upon the reaction of the suffering person, and cannot take place unless there is stimulus to some latent or potential goodness in the criminal. Intelligent kindness is a far more effective stimulus than any force can be. If force were the true cause of amendment, then its efficacy would increase with repetition. But all experience shows that a repetition of force merely hardens the prisoner and stimulates a desire for revenge.

Violence and severe punishment have proved unavailing for thousands of years. The facts compel us to admit that cruel punishment is not only ineffective but is injurious to prison wardens and to society as well as to the criminal. Also we now know that society is itself largely responsible for the conditions which create criminals. Non-violent curative methods are the only ones which work or can possibly work. This means careful psychiatric or psychological examinations and psychiatric treatment; remedial diet;¹⁵ medical care if need be; training in a useful craft or occupation; wise general education, good food, good quarters; decent, kindly, respectful treatment; many sorts of stimuli and opportunities for normal expression and living; wise probation; good juvenile and delinquent courts. The criminal courts should have only the function of deciding whether or not the crime has been committed and the accessory facts. They should have no power of punishment. Thereafter the case should be handled by physicians, psychiatrists, psychologists,¹⁶ social workers, teachers, and employment

agencies. The object should be not to make good prisoners but to make criminals into good citizens.

There are of course many dangerous and probably incurable criminals at present who require close restraint. They are the inevitable product of existing defective social processes and penal systems. They will not disappear nor will they cease to be manufactured until society itself is changed for the better. Prison reform and criminal reform are a part of general social and economic reform.

But when really sound treatment is given the criminals and when society steps forward in its own reform, the prison population will greatly decrease. Even the feeble minded and insane are capable of great improvement by proper treatment. Sound diet alone has worked wonders in numerous cases.

In the chapters on the psychology of non-violent resistance we stated that imitation and suggestion are most powerful when unconscious or subconscious. It is known that drunken people are very sensitive to suggestion, and that in many types of insanity the subconsciousness is peculiarly alert and sensitive. Many insane people seem to have an uncanny faculty of perceiving the real purposes of those with whom they come in contact. This type of sensitiveness may prevail also in certain types of delirium.

This suggests that real non-violent kindness would be a language which many cases of delirium, insanity, drunkenness and crime would understand and respond to in more instances than is ordinarily believed. Certain specific occasions where non-violence was successful in handling such cases confirm this conclusion.¹⁷ Good music, especially participation in well trained choral singing, has been found in at least one prison to exercise a profound and lasting beneficial influence on many criminals. Probably there are countless other unrecorded instances. Doubtless there are certain types of mental degeneracy where the nervous integrations are so badly injured that they are incapable of making any response

in kind to non-violent treatment. But they may be relatively few, and capable of unmistakable diagnosis and description.

It would be desirable for criminologists, psychiatrists and physicians to make a long and careful study of all types of crime, mental disease or disability in relation to the possibility and desirability of handling them by wholly non-violent or non-forceful methods. Too much is now left to the haphazard experience and hasty generalizations of wardens, nurses and attendants. Carefully worked out information codified into rules and made a subject of intelligent instruction would be of immense assistance to prisons, houses of correction, reform schools, insane asylums, hospitals, private nurses, policemen and physicians. The use of such rules would serve to increase considerably the respect and affection of many people for government and corrective and remedial institutions, and help also in the prompter reform and cure of many criminals and patients. By careful study it will be possible, I am confident, to reduce the amount and frequency of forcible restraint very considerably. What we need is a sincere, persistent, intelligent effort to eliminate it entirely, — to regard every obstacle thereto as an indication of our ignorance of human nature rather than as any inherent impossibility.

Violent defence against thieves and burglars arises out of our ideas about property. Most killings by thieves and other criminals are not strictly "in cold blood", but out of fear that the victim will somehow harm the criminal. But if the threatened victim is wholly unafraid, friendly, kind, generous, and imaginative, there is relatively small chance of his receiving physical injury.¹⁸ Such considerations indicate that it will be eventually possible and practicable to forego violent defence of property. It is a part of the duty of non-violent resisters to help bring such a state of affairs to pass. It will be for mankind as a whole a slow process, but there is no reason why the

progress should not be steady and sometimes, and at some places, rapid.

It is interesting to realize that non-violent resistance can be used both by the State and the prisoners. If the State considers itself the injured party and the criminal the attacker, it can offer him non-violent reformatory treatment. If the criminal is mentally competent and feels that really he is the victim of an unjust social system and brutal wardens and police, he too may offer non-violent resistance and do his share toward prison reform. In this connection, Gandhi's instructions for the jail conduct of political prisoners are of interest, though we have not space to quote them here.¹⁹

In some instances of sentencing innocent men to long imprisonments and even death, there has been much severe criticism directed against the governors, judges and other officials involved. This seems to me both a misconception of the real forces at work and a waste of energy. The fault does not lie with the men in office. The real causes are psychological and spiritual, and it is these and this institutionalized form that must be resisted and transformed. Governments are the external results of inner concepts and attitudes. They are the institutionalized forms of our habitual inner attitudes and ideas. Each one of us is partly responsible. The re-education must be directed primarily at this foundation, though, of course, it should find expression in all situations and relationships.

The police system also needs modification in the direction of constantly less violence. Certain police functions are necessary in any complex modern society,—such as directing traffic in city streets, providing information for strangers, helping to settle altercations without violence, helping lost children, directing large crowds, providing a disciplined orderly nucleus of leaders and helpers in times of public disaster such as fires, floods, earthquakes, severe storms, epidemics of disease, etc. Even after the advantages of non-violence become widely

recognized there will still be people whose habits of violence persist, whose self-control is poor, or who will still occasionally hope to gain their ends by violence. For a generation or two after such recognition it may be necessary to permit the police to use a greatly restricted amount of physical compulsion in certain cases where physical violence has already been used or overtly threatened by some other person. Experience in England over a number of years indicates that under such circumstances probably no firearms, sticks or brutality would be needed. Certainly strong efforts should be made to stop most police violence immediately and eliminate all police violence as rapidly as we can educate society to non-violence and eradicate the conditions which create violent crime. The policeman of the future by his example and leadership in firm, intelligent, strong, creative kindness can do much to educate the masses to non-violence as a part of daily routine life. It is in this direction, one hopes, that police systems will evolve, and indeed they must so evolve if we are ever to create a truly sound political order.

CHAPTER IX

PERSUASION

The foregoing chapters may have made non-violent resistance seem plausible. Yet many people who read them will still be sceptical of its effectiveness. This method under Gandhi's leadership, after over twenty years of effort, has not yet won freedom for India. The European mass persecutions, the world-wide bloodshed, destruction, starvation, ruthless cruelties, and horrors of all sorts during the past decade or more give pause to anyone. One's hopes are halted not only by the vastness of the devilment but also by its thoroughness.

Would highly disciplined and wholly determined aggressors ever be stopped by deeds of kindly persuasion? Could the holders of ultimate political and economic

power really be persuaded to yield up their power by the use of non-violent resistance? The history of mankind is so full of selfishness, violence, and cruelty that the possibility of improvement often seems doubtful. The power of entrenched interests is so immense and the energy of organized aggression is so tremendous that it is very difficult to see how gentle resistance plus love could either effectively sap such power or overcome or divert such energy. The destruction of both ponderables and imponderables by modern military weapons is so terrific that it is hard to believe that the power of slow acting, slight, or gentle forces can be superior. Are pacifists only naive builders of false Utopias?

Such experiences and doubts call for a still more searching study of the way and the power of gentle kindness and of firm voluntary suffering in moral resistance to a violent opponent. We must seek to comprehend in more detail how and why love is persuasive and creative. Let us try to appreciate, therefore, still further the importance of tiny, subtle forces and try to understand as fully as possible how they act and why their cumulative power is so great.

In nature the most important forces are silent. Examples are gravitation, sunlight, electro-magnetic forces, bacteria, the growth processes of plants and animals, the effects of environment. A considerable portion of material forces, such as gravitation, magnetism, heat, electric waves and sub-molecular forces, are, even under the microscope, invisible. Most of such forces, aside from their results, are unperceivable by man's sense of touch. A large number of important foci of energies, such as yeasts, cells, genes, hormones, vitamins, ions and protons, are exceedingly small. The operations of many of the forces essential to human life are relatively slow, and, in their effects, cumulative. Instances are the building of soil on which all land life depends, the warming up each spring of the soil and air in temperate climes, the full maturing of human beings, the flowering of a civilization.

Many forces which mould human beings, as for example the use of symbols or the desire for social status, are exceedingly subtle, to be appreciated and used only by the most observant. Yet how potent controls have those two forces been in the history of persons, villages, and empires !

In many cases exceedingly small forces can and do markedly influence vastly larger systems or organisms. A quart of oil dripped from the bow of a ship in a storm will, by the action of increased surface tension, prevent huge and very powerful waves from breaking, and this action takes place over a large area. A dilution of the animal hormone called adrenalin amounting to only one part in 250,000,000 will, when injected into the veins of a rabbit, cause a distinct effect on the blood vessels of its ear. The pituitary hormone when diluted to only one part in 100,000,000,000 causes strong uterine contractions in the female animal. Again, the minimum lethal dose of crude botulinus toxin filtrate is a fraction of a cubic centimeter represented by the number 1 over the number 4 followed by twenty ciphers. The odour of mercaptan in a dilution of 1 : 1,000,000,000,000 is perceivable by a dog. The odour of a female Chinese silk moth (*Actias selene*), although wholly unperceivable by a person directly beside her, attracted to her a number of previously marked male moths released at a distance of 11.6 kilometers (7.2 miles) away.¹ This ability of exceedingly small quantities to alter a relatively large system can be proved in that branch of mathematics called differential equations.

The ability of a minute force to alter a system which by comparison is very large is most frequently and clearly seen where the large system is complex or delicately balanced. The body of a human being is such a complex and delicately balanced set of forces and, as we know in the instance of hormones, the entire bodily poise, development, health and control is altered by the hormones in exceedingly small quantities. This is also true of the psychic aspect of man. Such subtle entities as hopes, with

no apparent basis in facts, will guide and sustain a person or a nation through years of effort or endurance. Think, for example, how the hopes of the Jews have buoyed them up through millenniums of political subjection. Society is a system of many complex forces in mobile equilibrium, and at various times the balance is delicate. It is subject therefore to alteration by minute forces.

In other instances the tiny forces affect the great mass by an accumulation. "Constant dropping wears away a stone." Stimuli far below what is called "the threshold of response," when sufficiently repeated, may cause an accumulative "staircase effect," often quite powerful.²

The accumulation may be by way of rhythm. A slight impulse may cause an infinitesimal yielding in a huge mass whose momentum makes it move back like a pendulum into the original position and beyond. As this takes time, the movement has in it the first stage of a rhythm. If the original impulse is applied again at the proper place and instant in the reaction, the first infinitesimal change is increased by a tiny degree. Repetition of this process in properly timed rhythm will eventually cause a very great change in the position of the large mass. Anyone who has enjoyed a swing in a hammock has, in homely fashion, experienced this. Engineers say that the properly timed tread of a cat could destroy a huge bridge.

Thus, many of the most important forces are not perceivable by our crude human senses. Aside from their ultimate results those forces in themselves are not dramatic or adequately appreciated by the majority of mankind. The connection between these imponderable forces and their ultimate effects is often so subtle or distant or slow that we fail to understand the originating forces. Yet, despite the slowness of human recognition, these forces are none the less real and powerful. Radio waves, for example, have always been present in storms, but man learned about them only within the last 60 years. Those

who come to appreciate and understand such subtle forces can put them to human use with immeasurable benefit.

Such a slight and subtle but immensely powerful force is the combination of loving-kindness and non-violent resistance.

Let us see further.

A great number of biological experiments have shown that living animals respond in one way or another to many kinds of stimuli. Such stimuli may be mechanical, electrical, thermal, chemical, light, changes of atmospheric pressure, changes of humidity of surrounding air, smells, food intake, work, glandular secretions, infections, drugs, emotions, and in man, sentiments and thoughts. These researches have also shown that the responses affect one or more of practically all the stimulated animal's organs, tissues or functions, and that the responses occur in phases.³ There are different kinds of phases. A one-phase or monophasic response is in one direction only, say a continuous increase in activity of some sort. A dual phase or biphasic effect is first one kind of reaction and then after a while a reversal to a reaction of just the opposite kind. Cocaine, for instance, in a dilution of 1 : 1000 first constricts the blood vessels of a frog and then dilates them.

Kotschau showed in a wealth of experiments⁴ that all responses of living tissues to stimuli could be grouped as follows : a slight stimulus will produce a weak monophasic response ; a medium strength stimulus causes a double phasic response which has a stronger effect at the beginning followed by a reversal ; while a strong stimulus or a very large dose causes a short, intense effect followed by irreversible injury. As an example of Kotschau's rule, Tanaka found that a small amount of adrenalin put into the blood stream of an animal shortens the time of clotting of blood and this shortening effect continues ; a moderate amount of adrenalin at first lengthens the blood clotting time and then shortens it ; while a large quantity of

adrenalin at first shortens the blood clotting time and then destroys the clotting ability permanently.

Experience as well as laboratory experiment indicates that the stimuli which cause animal organisms to grow are slight, causing a reaction of the monophasic type and must be many times repeated. Medical experience also indicates that in general the drug stimuli which most effectively and without harmful reactions restore a sick organism to health are also slight, causing a one-phase response without reversal.⁵

Consider the bearing of these observations on our subject.

The believer in non-violence does not assume with Rousseau that all persons at the beginning of their lives are inherently good, nor with Calvin and Barth that they are inherently and continuously sinful with only sporadic aspirations or goodness. He assumes that each person has inherently all the time both capacities, for good and for evil. Both potentialities are plastic. Which capacity will develop and how far it will develop depends on which one is stimulated to cause growth. The vast amount of evil in history has been largely due to the kinds of stimuli to which man has allowed himself to be subject. So the believer in non-violence assumes, on the basis of what seems to be sound historical and psychological evidence⁶ that, except for a few congenital mental defectives, every person has in him some tiny spark or potentiality of goodness. This is true no matter how encrusted that potentiality may be with habitual pride, prejudice, hatred, callousness, cruelty, or criminality.

Thus the faith of the non-violent resister in the ultimate flowering of the good potentialities of all people is not a blind or naive faith. It has a solid foundation in the above described intrinsic quality of all living protoplasm—the fact that all living organisms respond to stimuli, and that in the more complex organisms the responses are adapted to the stimuli so as to tend to preserve the species. Adaptation to environment is the large-scale

proof of this. In the most complex and delicately balanced organisms, such as man, the response tends to partake of the same quality as the stimulus.

Moreover, as we have already seen, responses are called forth by exceedingly small stimuli, such stimuli as in the moral field would be called gentle.

We have already mentioned the well-known biological fact that growth of living tissue is caused not by harsh, violent stimuli, but by prolonged repetition of slight or gentle stimuli. This is conclusively proved not only by laboratory experiments but by what takes place every spring. After the winter solstice the days gradually lengthen by intervals of one to three minutes — just that little bit more of sunshine each day. For thirty or forty repetitions of this stimulus there is, in northern continental lands anyhow, no apparent effect upon vegetation. To a laboratory experimenter these apparent failures would be very discouraging. He would say, "After such a series of flat failures it is preposterous to expect that stimulus to work." But in nature, after sixty or more such repetitions, there is a cumulative effect. The green grass begins to show, the buds swell and burst, the birds fly north, and after one hundred and twenty or more such stimuli we have a vast surge of energy and life in the vegetable, insect, and animal worlds — the spring and summer. This has gone on for hundreds of millions of years.

This principle of stimulus and response also acts upon man's intellectual faculties. All education, and indeed the growth of civilizations are based on this fact. We assume, for example, that every child has a potential capacity for mathematics. We subject the child to many repetitions of the gentle stimulus of solving mathematical problems in school, the problems increasing in difficulty day after day. After eight or ten years of development under that regime the child can easily solve mathematical problems which to Plato and Aristotle, the wisest men of ancient Greece, were utterly impossible. Part of the

advance is due to improved mathematical notation, but much also to thorough use of suitable stimuli. The process of stimulus and response can likewise immensely enhance man's emotional and moral faculties.

Thus, growth in response to gentle, appropriate, and sufficiently repeated stimuli is a sure thing, surer and more enduring than any form of political government, any economic action, or any military campaign. It is as sure as the fact that there is life on this planet. It can be relied upon without any hesitation or doubt.

Dictatorships cannot long grow or endure, because in them the stimuli are not gentle and so are incompatible with the inherent process of growth. That which cannot grow cannot adapt itself, and so cannot endure in this modern world of rapid social changes.

Thus the believer in non-violence is convinced that, because the potentiality for goodness exists in every living person, the potentiality itself is living, is therefore subject to the law of stimulus and response, and hence is capable of growth until, compared with the harmful living factors in any given person, it becomes as strong, or even stronger. This, I think, is what Jesus meant when he told his disciples to forgive seventy times seven — repeating many, many times the gentle stimulus to unity implied by forgiveness.

The believer in non-violence is also convinced from the examples in nature that the potentialities for goodness which are in a group, a corporation, or a nation can by suitable stimuli be made to grow beyond their potentialities for evil. The law of stimulus and response applies as much to a forest as to a single tree, to the actions of a herd of elephants as to the actions of one elephant. Among human beings a collective does not have initiative. That has to be supplied by individuals. A human collective, however, may have more versatility and intellectual range than an individual. But by means of suitable organization and discipline, groups are capable of highly moral actions

and reactions. Examples are found in the various struggles by non-violent resistance under Gandhi's leadership. Disciplined groups of several thousand people, mostly peasants, stood up to attacks by police with clubs, or to gunfire by soldiers, yet maintained complete non-violence and did not run. Other examples are the building of European cathedrals and the growth of consumers' co-operatives:

The statement that human collectives are less moral than the individuals which compose them is a highly doubtful generalization. The ability of a human collective to behave morally depends on such factors as the extent and duration of its organization, the structure of the organization, its size and the sizes of any component subgroups in it, the inter-relationships of the subgroups and the kind of integration among them, the kind of discipline (if any) to which the members have been subject, the duration of that discipline, the clarity of the ideas of the group and the extent of their permeation among the members, the extent and clarity of understanding of the group's purposes among its members, the loftiness of the common ideal, the simplicity or complexity of their general purpose, the quality of leadership, and the moral character of the environment. With so many variables as that, the broad generalization of the immorality of all human collectives is not valid. It disregards too much pertinent evidence. It does not square with the results of a wealth of patient and careful biological experiments and observations.⁷

Some of the doubts about the efficacy of non-violence are due to overlooking the necessity, in most cases, for many repetitions of the gentle stimulus, and forgetting that this takes time. We may learn also that in order to bring best results the stimuli need to be spaced in a certain rhythm. Everybody realizes that a war is made up of many, many skirmishes and battles, but plenty of non-violent resisters seem to expect this other kind of struggle to be successful and finished in short order. If success is

not prompt, they get badly discouraged. The lack of immediate victory does not prove the inefficiency of the method. The discouragement proves only a failure to understand the process. Those same people realize that in order to become a physician a person must go through eight years of grammar school, four years of high school, four years of college, four years of medical school, and sixteen to eighteen months of hospital internship—in all, twenty-five or twenty-six years of preparation. And success in the profession can come only after at least five more years of work. All that time is generally considered well spent. Yet in India and elsewhere some critics have called the method of non-violence folly because the teaching of it to a nation of 400,000,000 people, and their struggle to win freedom by such means, have won only partial advance after an effort lasting twenty-five years. If freedom is worth anything it is worth fifty or a hundred years of unstinted effort in rigid adherence to the method. The use of this non-violent method leads to steady improvement, while the use of violence gives a double-phase result, with a reversal and ultimate loss of what at first may seem to be won. It should be realized that in India each time a large-scale collective application of the method was used—in 1920-21, again in 1930-32, and again 1942-43—the unity of the desire of all parties and sections of Indians for freedom has steadily increased, despite the British governmental propaganda about Indian disunity. Also, Indian courage and self-respect have immensely increased.

Some sociologists believe that there can be no moral progress in society because, they say, the effort involved in any moral reform is always followed by an equal reaction, a swing-back of the pendulum. Society has an inertia, they aver, that resists all substantial change.

To the extent that society is a loosely integrated organism, an organism in, as it were, a low stage of development, it would tend to react to a stimulus in one of the three ways described by Kotschau as mentioned above.

In response to violent stimuli or to reforms introduced by coercive or deceitful methods it would presumably react in double phase, first yielding to the violence and then later reversing its acquiescence. But in response to honest, gentle stimuli, society would be likely to act in one-phase fashion with no swing-back. Note, for example, that the social alterations caused by the stimuli of using the spade and the automobile, a tool and a machine, have been constant without, as yet, any repudiation or reverse response.

Hence the above cited belief of certain sociologists seems to be too broad an assertion. If a reform be introduced into society by a gentle persuasion such as non-violent resistance, the analogy would indicate that the reaction would be monophasic and permanent. Considering society as an organism in a low stage of development, it may well be capable of growth into more complex integration. If so, the stimulus thereto should be non-violent. Or society may sometimes be sick and lacking its normal balance. To restore its equilibrium and health the thing needed is a series of non-violent stimuli.

Growth has another aspect that helps to explain the power of non-violence. Growth results in more than increase in size. When an organism grows there is a development of its ability to reach and use a wider range of energy. When a seed sprouts, its stem and its new leaves enable it to tap the energies of sunlight. The growing animal becomes able to roam over a considerable territory and thus enlarge its food sources, use the protection of vegetation, and perhaps enlist the support of some of its own kind. The growth of a highly developed organism like man enables him to reach, mobilize, organize and use a constantly increasing range of energies and subtle forces, some in the outer world of nature, others in the intellectual and moral realms through the co-operation and mutual assistance of his fellowmen.

The wider range of energy met and used by the growing organism enables it better to maintain its equilibrium

and its life in the face of adverse forces it may meet. Thus it acquires the ability to adapt itself to changes. This ability promotes survival.

Since growth takes place in response to gentle stimuli only, it would seem clear that the greater the use of gentle stimuli the more extensive become the possibilities of growth in more and more directions, and hence the wider becomes the range of energies available to the user of gentleness.⁸ In contact with this wider range of increasingly subtler forces he is either unconsciously supported by them or is consciously able to mobilize them and call upon them for support. The more he understands the method and the more he becomes aware of these subtler forces, the more he can rally them in support of a purpose that promotes their harmonious activity. By extension, that group, tribe or species which relies increasingly on gentle stimuli has the best chance for survival. That is why sensitive and delicately poised man has survived the monsters of earlier ages.⁹

For these reasons the intelligent user of non-violent resistance has for his help far greater total resources of energy and power than does his violent opponent. Some of these subtle powers are slow in action, but they are inevitably sure. History indicates that they are also more enduring than the forces of violence.

In nature the succession of gentle stimuli creating growth heals the effects of all the violent destructive forces such as earthquakes, floods, avalanches, lightning, and fires. Also, by building up forests and grasses and promoting ecologically useful wild animals, the gentle stimuli control the effects of storms and prevent floods and soil erosion. In the human realm the stimuli of gentle kindness not only heal the effects of violence but create relationships and situations which prevent violence.

Thus the power of non-violence and love is so similar to and so harmonious with the other subtle creative forces of nature that in the human realm it may be considered one of the higher conserving and growth-producing

forces of nature. As such, it is in the long run more powerful than violence.

We have stated that one of the essential elements of successful non-violent resistance is love, and that love is powerful. As Walt Whitman so finely said :

Be not dishearten'd — affection shall solve the problems of
Freedom yet ;

Those who love each other shall become invincible —

Were you looking to be held together by lawyers ?
Or by an agreement on a paper ? or by arms ?

Nay, nor the world, nor any living thing, will so cohere." 10

Besides the use of many repetitions of gentle stimuli, one other explanation of the power of love is this : Full-fledged love is the sentiment that grows out of awareness of the unity and wholeness of the entire human species, and expresses that awareness in all sorts of ways. The whole of anything is not only more than, but also different from, the sum of its parts.¹¹ Deeds informed by a loving desire for the unity and wholeness of society therefore make contact with and enlist the help not only of the forces of the separate elements of society but also of the forces that comprise and come out of its unity and wholeness. We know that sentiments — that is, organized systems of ideas and emotions — are extremely powerful in initiating, sustaining, and guiding all human conduct. Of all the sentiments, love is, for the above reasons, both quantitatively and qualitatively superior. Therefore, in the long run disciplined love always wins, and even in the short run disciplined love wins often enough to make it far, far superior to violence. Furthermore, intelligent love promotes deeds which provide normal relationships, healthful surroundings, and healthful and creative outlets for energy of all people of all ages. It thus reduces frustrations to a minimum, reduces anger, resentment, and violence.

In a conflict, what needs to be done is to change not people as such, but their attachment to certain ideas, sentiments, desires, and assumptions. Such changes are

not effected by killing or wounding the opponents. Usually being wounded and having friends or fellow countrymen killed does not cause people to abandon their ideas, sentiments, and so forth, but only to postpone trying to carry them out. To get opponents to adopt new ideas, new sentiments, new assumptions, you have to get them to want the new ideas, new sentiments, and new assumptions. The word "persuade" means literally "to make (something) sweet" to somebody. The new ideas must be made attractive to the opponents. Then they will take and hold the new ideas of their own will, and then the task is done. Ideas are not made attractive by harming the people whom you want to have adopt them. But love and disciplined non-violence are persuasive.^{11a}

In the persuasion of non-violent resistance there must be not only gentleness and love but also truth. All human beings make mistakes. Adherence to truth requires public admission of our mistakes. If out of pride or ignorance we wait until others show up our error, then people mistrust both our ability and our honesty. But public confession of faults promotes trust because it shows (1) a realization of one's likeness to all other people in respect to liability to error, hence a sense of human unity, (2) humility, (3) honesty, (4) disinterestedness toward one's own personal fortunes, (5) willingness to pay the price of mistakes, hence (6) a sense of responsibility, (7) courage, (8) a revival of intelligence after a lapse into stupidity, and therefore (9) worthiness to be given another opportunity, (10) a realization of an intellectual prerequisite to progress. When I have made a mistake in arithmetic I cannot correct it and get the right answer until after I have admitted, at least to myself, that I had made the mistake. Thus in the moral realm frankness and humility are modes of intelligence.

These are some of the reasons, for example, why during World War II, after Prime Minister Churchill voluntarily admitted to Parliament that the Government had made many blunders and caused grave losses and he

could promise little ahead but blood and tears, Parliament immediately gave him an overwhelming vote of confidence. Unfortunately, in regard to their mistakes toward other nations, neither Churchill nor the British ruling class are as yet intelligent enough to make public admission of errors. This is true of practically all political leaders in all nations. The only exceptions I can think of are Lenin and Gandhi.

Since trust is an essential prerequisite to persuasion, and truth creates trust, persistent devotion to truth at all costs is strongly persuasive.

Summing it up, we see that non-violent resistance with love is able to conquer cruelty, violence, aggression, and other abuses of power because (1) the power of many repeated gentle stimuli to cause surpassing growth of the potential decencies in the opponent is sure, (2) the user of gentle stimuli has aiding him a wider and more enduring range of forces than does the user of violence, (3) the whole is greater than the sum of its parts and as love expresses the unity and wholeness of the human species, it is a power greater than those that express only individuals or other parts of humanity, (4) intelligent love acts in advance to reduce or prevent frustrations and thereby to reduce violence to a minimum, (5) truth is an important element in non-violence, and as truth promotes mutual trust, it is highly persuasive, (6) these powers are effective between groups as well as between individuals.

But in a situation which is very dangerous, or where much is at stake, if someone urges me to use a new instrument, I do not adopt it when I merely learn what in general are the forces which make it work. I must also understand why and how it works in specific dangers or toward specific obstacles. I must feel sure that the risks are less than those of formerly used methods, and that the estimate of probabilities is more accurate than formerly.

Heretofore we have considered only broad classes of conflicts. Let us now examine in more detail certain

common obstacles, namely cruelty, loss of liberty, aggression, desire to dominate, dual loyalties, hostile sentiments, the opponent's habits, paranoia or megalomania of the opponent, the opponent's assumptions, interracial conflicts, the intense discipline of certain opponents, and our own weaknesses.

Gross, persistent, intentional cruelty toward helpless people, such as the Nazi treatment of the Jews, the Japanese treatment of the Chinese, the British political whippings of Indians, and American lynchings and police third-degree methods, is so revolting that most decent people become indignant and can see no effective answer but counter-violence.

We have already discussed¹² some of the ways by which non-violent resistance tends to reduce cruelty. But there is another kind of cruelty which the psychologists call sadism. It is intentional. Its exercise gives the cruel person pleasure. In it there is a desire for power and an element of aggression which is the result of accumulated prior resentments created by severe repression or humiliation. The aggression is "displaced"; that is, it is not expressed toward the person who caused the original frustration but against another and weaker person. The desire for power is to make up for the sense of weakness felt at the time of the original frustration. Used against this type of cruelty, non-violent resistance alters the desire for power, as already described, by the reaction of the spectators teaching the cruel person that that sort of power is disadvantageous. The gentle resister proposes another channel in which the cruel person may display a more valuable kind of power. By respect for the personality of the cruel attacker, non-violent resistance assuages the affront to self-respect which carried over from the original humiliations or frustrations suffered by the cruel person. These developments tend to reduce this kind of cruelty.

Another cause of cruelty is what psychologists call "projection," resulting in what is generally called making

a scapegoat of someone. Projection occurs where one has a defect of character or a wrongful motive the existence and evil character of which he is dimly aware but unwilling to acknowledge even to himself. This creates a conflict within him between his lower nature and his conscience. He has an underlying feeling of shame and a sense of guilt. In desperation he proceeds to "project" the fault or harmful motive upon, or impute it to, some other person or group of persons. Then he can speak of it openly, blind himself completely to its existence in himself, and attack the other person for it. Thus by this self-deception he relieves his conflict and satisfies his conscience. For his own sins the guilty person thus makes the innocent person suffer. The innocent person becomes a scapegoat.¹³ In such a situation the guilty person, by the energy of his conflict and the force of his conscience often is fearfully cruel.

Those who for a long time have believed in the power of gentle loving-kindness will have acted accordingly, and their deeds will have had a constructive, preventive action which will usually protect them against cruel aggression. For example, because the Quakers during and after World War I fed several million starving German children and mothers, they were less restricted or molested by the Nazis than any other religious group. Such kindness was shown by many Danes toward the Nazis prior to 1939, and the results have mollified Nazi treatment of Denmark.

In a case of projection, non-violent resistance alone can act but slowly. The processes described in previous chapters operate gradually to bring the attacker to true knowledge of himself. The insistence upon human unity and truth eventually overcome the divisiveness of the cruel person. But in order to secure this result the non-violence must be free from fear or anger. In some instances, in order to provide the repetitions of stimuli mentioned above, there have to be many non-violently resisting victims before the result is obtained. Yet, as compared with the number of victims where the reaction

to the cruelty is fear, anger, and violence, non-violent resistance is less costly and more effective.

"But while we wait for this result," you may exclaim, "the aggressor will deprive us of all our liberty and then will educate our children into his pernicious doctrines! Liberty is of supreme value. How can non-violence preserve it?"

Liberty is not an entity which can be secured by direct effort. Liberty is a by-product. It is the result of the creation of mutual trust and respect. Liberty is a moral affair and can be won only by moral means. After it has once been created and is threatened, true liberty cannot be preserved by violence, but only by the same moral means by which it was originally created. That wars have shifted the location of power is true, but where the result seems to have been freedom, that freedom is, I believe, the result of other causes that were non-violent. In the past, true freedom has been won only by mutual respect for personality, by trusting in the power of truth, and by cultivating unity, kindness, and love, not merely as sentiments but by concrete, habitual deeds. Where those efforts and attitudes are found continuously, there will be freedom. Freedom has declined because we have failed to practice our ideals.

Some civil and religious liberties in the West were purchased for us by the non-violent resistance of the first Quakers in England and by the creative, non-violent activities of others. Many of our modern freedoms are spurious, being merely the luxurious margins allowed us by the ruling group because such allowance was the simplest way to keep the ship of state quiet and easy to handle, and because technological advances made possible considerable freedom to the majority without any loss of real control by the ruling group. Such freedoms are not fully moral, nor were they earned. In times of war and considerable economic decline they will decrease or depart.

When our liberties are taken from us by aggressors, whether foreign or domestic, we must again earn them. We can earn them only by payment of the price, namely non-violent resistance and the development of those conditions that create mutual trust.

So it is a mistake to think that liberty is of supreme value. What is of supreme value is the origin of liberty, namely, non-violent conduct and the above-mentioned elements which create mutual trust and mutual respect. Let those who call themselves Christians note that Christ said exceedingly little about freedom or its worth, but he laid very great stress on those attitudes and acts which result in mutual respect and trust.

Society has always regarded social order more important even than liberty, and in times of crisis has permitted deprivation of liberties in the hope of securing order. But inasmuch as permanent order cannot be created or maintained by violence but only by the elements which create mutual respect and trust, the vigorous maintenance of those elements is more important even than order, for they are the creators not only of freedom but also of order. Christ also said very little about the importance of order.

Nor should parents be too troubled lest a cruel dictator entice their children into accepting his doctrines. Children who from birth have lived in an atmosphere of national frustration or resentment which has created a certain type of leader will readily accept the teachings of that leader. He expresses vocally what they subconsciously feel. But the children of a conquered nation will not accept the doctrines of a foreign conqueror. The cruelties and coercions of defeat create an energy that cannot be overcome by coercion. The history of every conquered nation is proof of that fact. Even a domestic tyrant cannot extirpate the love of liberty. It is inherent in man's very physical nervous constitution.

But we still must try to discover how the tremendous energy of aggression can be reduced by non-violent resistance. Modern psychological studies indicate that a very great deal of aggression is due to earlier frustrations.¹⁴ Every time a frustration occurs in a person's life, from earliest infancy onward, the energy of the thwarted desire is damned up inside and, unless it finds a complete and wholly satisfying substitute channel and goal, it remains bottled up as explosive energy awaiting an opportunity for release. Or we may liken the energies of frustrated desires to so many internal wound-up watch springs. We may say that there is a psychological law of conservation or persistence of the energy of emotions and of desires. People who have suffered many small or a few great frustrations have a great accumulation of energy seeking expression. And because of the persistence of resentment from the original frustration, this energy does not usually find release in ordinary work but prefers some form of aggression against people.

The very severe disciplines in Japanese family and national life may well have accumulated sufficient frustrations to have caused part of the Japanese cruelties toward Chinese, as at Nanking. National frustrations of Germans could thus account for many Nazi excesses. Both British and Japanese, being island peoples have unusually strong "in-group" loyalties and clannishness. Perhaps the British upper class custom of sending their sons away from home to boarding school when in their very early teens creates loneliness, emotional losses, and frustrations which later find expression in imperialist aggression and harshness toward subject coloured races. Unhappy child life and frustrations may account for many American cruelties.

Non-violent resistance saps this dammed up energy by showing respect for the personality of the aggressor and thus mollifying some of the earlier resentments. Gentle resistance mobilizes and calls into action outside influences which help to change the character of the

aggressor and his modes of action. Again, non-violent resistance deprives the violent aggressor of the satisfactions which he would get from attacking a person who showed fear, anger, or counter-violence. And kindness prepares the way for the acceptance by the aggressor of a proffered substitute goal and channel for his energies.

Besides frustrations, there are other causes for aggression, such as possessiveness and fear of strangers. These causes operate also among animals. Because in earlier chapters, either expressly or implicitly, we have indicated how these may be dealt with, we will not consider them further here.

But the above-mentioned factors do not always offset all the energy of aggression. The absorption of the surplus energy of aggression rests on a different set of considerations.

In relation to all other species of living organisms, the human species is a unit. Its elements are individual persons and they have among themselves certain differences and certain similarities. However important the differences may seem, the similarities and unities are deeper, more enduring, and more important. This is true also as between various groups, such as civilizations, races, nations, tribes, religious groups, and social classes. The unities and the interworking of differences are such that the human species as a whole may be considered a loosely integrated organism. If that be true, then, as in any organism, an injury to one part harms all the other parts, injures their harmonious working and upsets their equilibrium. Each part suffers and endures the suffering. If the original injury is an infection some of the neighbouring parts, which are, so to say, wholly innocent, may even die from the injury. In a healthy organism the parts thus indirectly injured do not strike back but, as it were, offer their energies for a curative process. Their energy absorbs and cushions the shock to the whole organism. Thus the equilibrium of the whole organism is gradually restored.

When by aggression the moral equilibrium of society has been upset, in order to restore that equilibrium and regain moral health, part of the energy of the aggression must be cushioned and absorbed by the non-violent voluntary suffering of persons who may be wholly innocent of the frustrations which caused the aggression, and relatively innocent of possessiveness or fear of strangers.

The innocent have always suffered for the sins of the guilty. If each of us reaped only what he individually had sown, no more and no less, it would be unjust for the innocent to suffer for the guilty. But in this world each person does not reap, either of good or evil, just what he has sown. Each of us enjoys a share of the entire technical, intellectual, and moral advances that have accumulated in society since the dawn of human history. This is vastly more than any of us could make by himself or deserves or has earned. In the same way each of us carries part of the load of mistakes and wrongs committed by our forefathers and our contemporaries, irrespective of biological inheritance or apparent national or racial community. Furthermore, very few are wholly innocent. Most of us condone or support evil institutions or public wrongs of many sorts. The guilty suffer, too, though often unawares. That is, their losses may be subtler, more indirect, and seemingly slower to arrive, but are deeper and injure not so much their bodies as their minds and souls.

Regarding both innocent and guilty as parts of a great organism, the innocent necessarily must suffer. Indeed, their suffering is proof of the organic unity of humanity. If they did not suffer, it would mean that they had no connection with the rest of the species. Their suffering is proof that the differences between all persons are not so important as the unities and similarities.

In this aspect of the matter the difference between guilt and innocence is relatively superficial. The common life, the life of the species, is more important, and the prime duty of the innocent is not toward securing

justice but toward restoring the moral health and equilibrium of the entire human society all over the world. I do not mean that those who suffer injustice should timidly lie down under it, but that the aim of their non-violent resistance should be more than justice. They cannot restore the equilibrium of society by counter-violence but only by resolute patience, love, kindly non-violent resistance and voluntary suffering. Happily the very use of these non-violent means will bring not only justice for themselves but moral balance for society. Though they may not have asked for it, the relatively innocent have the tough but surpassingly important task of saving humanity.

In a moral realm such as the world of mankind, mistakes and wrongs must necessarily be paid for and corrected. Because the world is complex and constantly changing and some people's lives are short, the payments and corrections are not usually fully made by those who make the mistakes. Whenever someone causes a frustration, it is paid for in part by other persons.

But happily, because this is a moral world, if payment for wrong is voluntarily undertaken by anyone, and non-violent suffering for it is assumed with love, the full payment does not have to be made. It is, as it were, discounted.

Justice alone would seem to require full payment of every moral debt. Justice deals with the mutual relations of the elements of society. So does love. But love, as previously explained, is more powerful because it also expresses the forces of the whole. Thus, as compared with justice, love brings more forces into the healing process and re-establishes the moral equilibrium more rapidly and easily. Without need for balancing off every separate wrong by an equal separate right, love instead balances off part of the wrongs by the forces of the whole. Therefore, loving action, such as voluntary suffering with love for the sake of principle, is never dissipated or lost. Sooner or later it bears fruits. Gentle loving-kindness thus

absorbs and counterbalances the extra energy of aggression. By comparison with a struggle of mutual violence, non-violent resistance enables the forces of the whole to greatly reduce the destruction and losses and sufferings.

If we had to rely on justice alone to right the sum total of all the mistakes and evils inherited from the past; as well as those of the present, the situation would seem well nigh hopeless. But non-violence and love can change our despair to hope.

In most conflicts there is present in both parties the desire to dominate. We may say that the prevailing concept of human relationships involves dominance of one person and subordination of the other.¹⁵ This assumption prevails in the family as between parents and children and as between the older and younger children, in school as between teacher and pupils, and in industry and agriculture as between employer and employee. War is merely an application of this same pattern in a critical situation between nations. People accept wars because they do not see the possibility of any other pattern of human relationships. In this framework of relationships people are always very reluctant to alter their status, their values, or their desires.

But non-violent resistance, plus kindness, offers an entirely different pattern based not on dominance-submission but on a relationship of integration. This is a relationship that often exists momentarily and could be made permanent and prevalent. This relationship is not a denial of differences of qualities and function; it does not abolish division of labour or differences of function. In this relationship each party is in search of common purposes in activities that are mutually satisfying to himself and others. Each party is sure of his essential nature, shows trust and expects trust, is eager for growth and aware that growth means change in himself and his relationships, is respectful of the personality of others, free from fear, and eager for truth. Under such circumstances each person will spontaneously yield when by so

doing he can promote the common purpose or win closer to the truth. To promote this he will sacrifice himself for truth and for the search for common purpose. He is willing to have his actions and his vision tested by the actions, ideas and values of other persons. The result of such interaction is not compromise but growth and adaptation, a change of character but no loss of personal integrity.¹⁶ If there is a loss or injury of possessions, there is an increase in security. If there is a change in social status, it is an improvement and realized as such by the person undergoing it.

But it is no wonder that violent persons assume at first that this method of non-violent resistance is merely crazy and that non-violent resisters are as eager as anyone else for dominance. The great age and wide prevalence of the pattern of dominance on one side and submission on the other blinds the violent person to the possibility of any other sort of human relationship, to say nothing of his possible ability to help create such a different relationship. He feels that if he yields even a trifle, his opponent will take advantage and try to dominate him and harm his security, his social status, and his personal integrity. Knowing also the energy of resentment against frustrations, and more or less aware that his dominance causes frustrations in other people, he feels the need of being constantly on guard, a sense of constant uncertainty and insecurity. The source of all attempts at dominance is this deep sense of insecurity. To reduce the desire for dominance this sense of insecurity must be relieved.

There are several elements in non-violent resistance which tend to reduce in the violent opponent this feeling of insecurity. Some of them are respect for personality, good will, acts of kindness, adherence to truth, disciplined order, a belief that human unity and underlying similarities are more enduring and important than human differences, and a steady series of deeds in accord with that belief.

Another important factor in relieving the violent person's sense of insecurity is the non-violent resister's faithfulness to his method despite losses of property, physical injury, imprisonment, or even death. Such proofs of sincerity are highly persuasive. If in time of crisis the advocate of non-violence abandons that method and in alleged necessary self-defence resorts to violence, the onlookers and the violent opponent say, "Aha! He talked pretty smoothly, but in a pinch he believes that you must dominate or be dominated. We can't trust him. His talk of a new system of human relationships is hypocritical bunk."

Where the non-violent resister is killed in the struggle, his sincerity and devotion raise up others to support his cause. This is proved by many instances, chief of which is the continuance and spread of Christianity despite the violent death of its founder. Admitting all the failures of the churches, there are still enough real followers of Christ to make this statement true. The vitality of non-violent resistance enables its trust-promoting qualities to endure and the repetition of stimuli to be prolonged. Even in the extreme case, and indeed because of the extreme case, the sense of insecurity in the violent party is relieved. Then dominance seems less necessary and the first steps of creating the new set of relationships can be begun. When that new framework can be gradually institutionalized the desire for dominance, except in abnormal persons, will be gone.

The dominance of some people is often called forth by an unwillingness in many to accept and exercise responsibility, and by a desire of others to be dominated. Certain people, perhaps because of lack of energy, prefer to acquire self-respect and give dignity to their ego not by their own exertions but by some mode of subordinate association or identification, often only fanciful, with those whom they consider great or with a big corporation or a powerful government. Some subordination grows out of political or economic ignorance.

In all these instances the dominance of the rulers is a resultant of the weakness of the masses. Non-violent resistance and its discipline tends to remove such weaknesses among those who practice it. Therefore, in that respect, also, it weakens the dominance of those in power.

In regard to the desire to dominate, I would distinguish the instances where the violently dominating person, or group, has a bona fide ability for management and administration. There certainly are such people, born with a keen ability to understand human relationships and a capacity for organizing and stimulating people to joint endeavours.¹⁷ Such a talent is of much social value, provided it is exercised without pride, selfishness, or coercion, and in a sincere and pure spirit of service. It would be a grave mistake to completely deprive such people of an opportunity to function just because many of them have warped the situation to their own advantage and have used violence. I would therefore be quite willing to allow such talented people to stand for office and be chosen by democratic process to act as executives, provided they are subject to the veto power of well trained non-violent resistance of those whose affairs they may administer.

To such persons the non-violent resisters could wisely say in effect, "We do not seek to deprive you of your true status and function, but merely to get you to purge yourself of the desire to dominate and coerce us. If you will truly serve the people unselfishly and honestly and without coercion we will be glad to have you exercise your undoubted talents." When once that understanding got home, the energy of skilled administrators who also are sincere would in many cases leave the road of selfishness and violence and seek a satisfactory settlement. Their essential social status being made secure, they would perhaps be more willing to yield up their former privileges and adapt themselves to a new situation.

The combination of this pattern of dominance-submission and the relation between frustration and aggression makes it clear why violence does not solve any

conflicts. It may change their form but it does not end them. Violence ends in the frustration of the defeated party. Because the energy of emotion, intellect, and will is persistent, frustration inevitably creates some sort of subsequent aggression, perhaps against someone else. That causes another outburst of violence, ending in another frustration, and so to endless waste, cruelty, suffering, and loss. The vicious circle can be broken only by indomitable patience, non-violent resistance, and kindness. The price is high, but very much less than that of violence.

Often another obstacle for non-violent resistance to overcome is what may be called the opponent's dual loyalty, his loyalty to standards of personal morality and his loyalty to his group whether that group be a society, a corporation, a social class, a government, a nation, or an unorganized race. Often these two loyalties clash because of a conflict between the moral codes and purposes of the group.¹⁸ This conflict may be severe enough almost to constitute a kind of schizophrenia. It is probably one of the causative factors in the enormous amount of mental disease in the modern world.

Out of a sense of duty to the nation a man who in private life has the highest standards of rectitude, will in his capacity as a government official or diplomat, publicly and emphatically tell a lie. There was a famous example of this during the First World War when Sir Edward Grey, then Secretary of State for Great Britain, in a speech to Parliament denied the existence of the secret treaties with Russia and France which he himself had taken part in making and which were revealed to the world later when the Bolsheviks siezed power in Russia. In the same way many officers of large industrial corporations in controversies with labour unions will, out of loyalty to what they believe to be the interests of the corporation, engage in deceit and violence which would be utterly foreign to them in their personal relationships.

Because of this dual loyalty, non-violent resisters to such an organization's policies will find men of fine personal character as the leaders of their opponents ordering or acquiescing in acts of atrocious injustice or cruelty, and seemingly adamant against appeals to human decency.

Continued non-violent resistance overcomes this difficulty in two ways. It gradually clarifies the relation between means and ends. It leads opponents who have come to think of the existence and habitual functioning of their organization as so important that it is an end in itself, to realize that their organization originally was and still is only a means to a finer and greater end. That realization may lead them to see that the organization, or its accustomed modes of action, can be altered so as to accomplish better the finer end. Again, non-violent resistance, in ways that are not yet clear not only solves cases of opposition and conflict between two persons, or two groups, but also integrates the different levels or compartments into which modern secular men have divided their lives. This process takes place in both the non-violent resister and his violent opponent. If the violent opponent out of loyalty to his organization is doing acts inconsistent with personal morality, the gradual increase of integration within him will enable him somehow to resolve that inconsistency and bring the organization's moral code closer in line with personal morality.

Sentiments play a great part in the affairs of all people. From all the discussions in previous chapters it is not difficult to see that non-violent resistance plus friendliness can alter the sentiments which control the opponent. Some sociologists think that sentiments change so exceedingly slowly that for any person to make persistent attempt to change the sentiments of others is a mark of immaturity or stupidity. Yet who would deny that Buddha, Plato, Jesus Christ, Mohammed, Martin Luther, Galileo, Newton, Gandhi and Sun Yat Sen altered the sentiments of millions? And who would accuse these

men of immaturity? The last twenty-five years have seen a great development of the sentiments of nationality and patriotism among the hundreds of millions of China and India. Sentiments can be altered, and modern psychology has indicated some of the ways.

The reluctance of people to change their habits of thought, feeling, and action is a form of inertia which is another obstacle for non-violent resistance to overcome. The longer the habit has continued, the harder it is to change.

A part of the strength of habit lies in the fact that in habit there is an element of pattern, partly intellectual, partly of sentiment, partly of will and action. One of the greatest aids to change of habit is, then, a change of intellectual pattern. By its stimulus to the imagination of the opponent, non-violent resistance causes such a change of pattern and thus brings about the desired change of habit. The greater significance and moral beauty in the pattern of non-violent resistance aid its ability to alter other habits.

In some instances the non-violent resister may have to struggle against a person or group of persons afflicted with real megalomania or even paranoia. In such cases the only successful treatment by psychiatry has been by means of steady friendliness, non-violence, working from an area of clear perception in the patient to a clear understanding of his error and a better knowledge of himself. Non-violent resistance is a sort of "field psychiatry". It takes time and involves suffering by the non-violent party. But the method is effective and creative, and it is the only method that is effective.¹⁹

Since the assumptions of people in conflict are usually different, and also control conduct, probably no conflict can be permanently solved unless the pertinent assumptions of one or both parties are changed. The change may or may not require recognition, explicit formulation, and acknowledgement of the assumptions. But changing

another person's assumptions is an important part of persuasion, of changing the heart of an opponent.

A person's assumptions lie very deep. They exist prior to any reasoning. They cannot be either proved or disproved by logic. They precede explicit beliefs. Like the axioms in geometry or the rules in a game, they are at the basis of all of a person's actions and govern their character and direction. Sometimes a person is occasionally and dimly aware of his assumptions ; more often he is wholly unconscious of them. Some assumptions are relative, depending on still deeper assumptions ; others are absolute.

The search for one's assumptions, whether made by oneself or someone else, requires keen discrimination, honesty, disinterestedness, and close thinking. It is disquieting. The more nearly absolute the assumption, the more does one usually dislike the search. Dragging up roots is painful. To have to face one's own assumptions in the clear light of full consciousness brings out so many unforeseen implications that the sudden revelation is often startling. Sometimes inconsistencies appear that are most uncomfortable. The sudden demand for thinking out all the implications and interconnections and inconsistencies call for more time and energy than one is willing to devote. It is felt as a strain. It may even involve humiliation.

Since assumptions lie so deep, it is hard to see how they can be changed. One thing that makes change in them possible is the fact that assumptions do not exist singly and separately either in a person or in a civilization. Assumptions exist, as it were, in constellations. In such a constellation some assumptions are dominant, others are recessive. The elements are not entirely consistent or harmonious. The constellations are therefore not in perfect equilibrium but in a more or less unstable state of strain or tension.²⁰

Non-violent resistance is a deep, thorough and persistent search for truth. It operates both in the conscious

mind and also in the imagination and subconsciousness. It permeates all areas of the lives of both opponents. This search therefore tests assumptions, and if some of them are mistaken the strain upon them is increased. Presently, because of the unstable equilibrium plus the new strain, the constellation has to alter, and with that comes an alteration in the mistaken assumption. The process takes time, but in persuasion such alterations are of great importance.

There is probably one other way in which assumptions are altered. When remarkable results are obtained by a new method, people are compelled to re-examine all the thinking that went into the previous methods, and sometimes to carry their analysis clear back to their prior assumptions and revise them. The careful and precise use of the inductive method of logic in science produced such notable results that thinkers all over the western world changed many of their former assumptions. So, after considerable victories have been won by non-violent resistance, those who have lost those struggles will be likely to modify their prior assumptions.²¹

Interracial conflicts are another obstacle which non-violent resistance will meet. They are complex. In part they are economic or "class" phenomena, in part political, in part social. They involve all of the obstacles already discussed; mistaken assumptions, fear of strangers, pride, possessiveness, cruelty, desire to dominate, frustration and aggression, habit, and dual loyalty. This very complexity, however, serves to emphasize the utter futility and stupidity of using violence as a solution. That method can produce nothing but more violence and ultimately destruction of all the different civilizations and their total freight of human values. While the complexity indicates that the solutions will require great patience and forbearance and will necessarily be slow, nevertheless the only means of solution are love and non-violent resistance.

Some people stand aghast at the thoroughness of the discipline of certain aggressor nations or classes, and think

that such a factor could not be overcome by non-violent resistance. The answer is that it is possible and not too difficult for the believers in non-violence to devise and practice a discipline which is still more thorough and profound, still more in accord with a wider range of subtle powers, and therefore still more powerful than the discipline of those aggressor nations.

Some people do not see how non-violent resistance could possibly be effective against bombing from the air. Usually such bombing has not and would not be used unless the people of the bombed places had themselves used violence. Such bombing does not last indefinitely. It is followed by some sort of contact and parley. At that time the elements of non-violence begin to operate. The continuance of life in Malta, Chungking, Hamburg, and Berlin is evidence that such bombing does not end all resistance.

There is not space here to discuss every possible kind of opposition that may be met in an opponent to non-violence. But the foregoing are perhaps the main types. There are in non-violence more elements of strength than we yet know. The discussion will perhaps serve to reassure the doubters of the persuasive power of non-violence and thus lead them to try it.

But there is yet another kind of obstacle which non-violent resisters will meet and must overcome. It resides not in their opponents but in themselves. It is made up of the inconsistencies, temptations, and corruptions which beset non-violent resisters, also their attachment to certain habits and institutions which are inconsistent with non-violence. These resisters are all common human clay and subject to defects. The overcoming of these defects is part of the function of training and discipline and will be discussed in a subsequent chapter.

Lastly, we should realize that we must learn how to persuade not only our active opponents but also those who are indifferent, those who are curious spectators, and our children and ourselves. For all these kinds of persuasion

we need a thorough understanding of the method of non-violence and its working and its disciplines. We must know what are the methods and disciplines and how and why they work.

CHAPTER X

THE NEED FOR TRAINING

For various reasons many people see no necessity for training for non-violent resistance. Many are even repelled by the idea. Some think that such training would produce unpleasant self-consciousness or even insincerity and smug self-righteousness. Others think it liable to lead to dogmatism and fanaticism. Some see it resulting in loss of initiative, dreary uniformity, or boredom. Still other are made vaguely uncomfortable by the idea without being able to define the reason. These various objections will be dealt with during the discussion.

While any course of action or inaction, if unwisely pursued, has dangers, that is no reason for holding off from useful action. Let us see some reasons why training in this matter is useful.

The general environment and herd pressure are powerful, constant influences upon every one of us. They will assuredly bend and mould us into the prevailing pattern unless we take specific measures and make special efforts to do otherwise. Non-violent resistance is different from the usual course of conduct and different from our primitive reactions. It will therefore require efforts specially designed. Regular training is a specially designed and specially potent factor of one's environment. If military conscription should become permanent, then unless we choose for ourselves and our children a different type of training, we should all be disciplined into the military mould and compelled to fight.

All of us are creatures of habit. Habits are necessary in order to save energy and enable us to use our minds. If I had to direct consciously every muscle in

my legs to act in right tension and right sequence all the time I was walking, I would hardly have time enough even to steer in a certain direction, to say nothing of planning what to do when I got to my destination. The time I spent while a baby learning how to walk, getting those muscles trained to habitual action, was well spent. If I am active I have one kind of habits; if lazy I have another kind. Always I have some sort of habits. Hence I must choose which kind of habits I will have; and, having chosen, I must then subject myself to the process of learning, of habit formation, that will produce that particular kind of habitual action. Non-violent resistance of a sporadic sort would accomplish almost nothing more than to give us a reputation for freakishness and unreliability. To be effective it must be habitual. To establish such a new habit calls for a somewhat prolonged process of habit formation.

If you care about non-violence and want to have it become effective either in your own personal relationships or over a larger area, you must put energy into your concept of it and make it live. This involves making it a way of living and requires habit forming.

We have seen that growth of all kinds requires many repetitions of slight stimuli. This is another way of describing one important aspect of the learning process, that is to say, of training.

Because in the modern world our moral relationships are often complex and confusing very few people can instantly think, in many events involving conflict, just what is the right thing to do. Therefore, previous training in an effective way of solving conflicts would be a great help. As Gerald Heard has pointed out, at the instant when action is demanded of us we do not have time to think through the whole situation, and so we act according to our assumptions, our sentiments, and our habits. Hence, if you prefer a certain kind of action it is wise to prepare in advance the sentiments and habits that will automatically produce that kind of action.

We have learned in the previous chapter that frustrations cause resentment, and that the energy of accumulated resentments may last for years and usually results in aggression or anger in some form. Since we all have had countless frustrations during our lives, we all are in danger of acting aggressively under provocation, be it ever so slight. Our self-control is therefore weak. But if we would like always to act gently, we must somehow reduce this pent-up reservoir of aggressive tendencies. A course of training which, among other things, would automatically reduce this store of trouble-making energy would produce conduct much nearer to what we desire.

The self-control involved in non-violent resistance is a kind of skill, a skill not only in a method of persuasion but in a way of living. Getting any skill requires training and practice, first in its details and finally in the entirety.

At this point let us consider the alleged dangers of training for non-violent resistance. Take the fear that it would lead to priggishness or insincerity. Can that fear be based on the idea that learning an effective method of handling conflicts is morally dangerous to those who use it?

Resort to the courts is one mode of handling conflicts, but nobody hesitates to study law because it might make him priggish or insincere. Personal violence is another mode of dealing with conflict, but nobody refrains from learning to box or to wrestle or to shoot for fear of becoming smug. War is yet another method of handling large scale conflict, but nobody dreads the study of military science lest it make him self-righteous. It is true that non-violent resistance may require endurance of suffering, loss of property, or even death, but so also may the use of force. Non-violent resistance endeavours to influence other people intellectually and morally, but so also do politics and the arts and sciences of child care, education, and psychiatry. Nobody considers those studies likely to make a person morally unpleasant.

Let nobody think that acquiring skill in non-violent resistance results in superficial actions which do not grow naturally and truly out of an inner condition, hence resulting in hypocrisy. The changes induced by the training, just as in military training, alter the source of the responses as well as the responses themselves. Of course, if one does not understand the need for training and the reasons for and results of each detail in the training, it may become a meaningless ritual, and one then may become insincere. But that can happen in any discipline — scientific, religious, aesthetic, or military — and is due not to the discipline itself but to the narrowness or forgetfulness of the teacher.

Again, let nobody think that acquiring skill in non-violent resistance is becoming saintly. Formerly non-violence was practised only by saints, but it is no longer so limited. The invention of a discipline has changed that. A discipline is like a tool. Tools, whether tangible or intangible, make it possible for ordinary men to do what formerly was possible only to men of very unusual skill, strength, or intellect. The mould-board plough, for example, made it possible for every farmer to cultivate even more land than formerly a very skilled and powerful man could do. A thousand years ago very few people could read or do geometrical problems. The invention of printing plus institutionalized public education made it possible for practically everyone both to read and to develop skill in geometry. Military discipline, another kind of tool, changes men of indifferent courage into heroes. So the invention by Gandhi of a discipline for non-violent resisters made the thing possible for hundreds of thousands of Indian peasants who were not saints but ordinary people. Hence, if now a person decides to undergo training for non-violence, he is not priggishly announcing that he is going to be a saint, nor should anyone attribute to him that intention or attitude.

A person does not create moral power. It comes to him only after he has complied with certain principles.

This complying enables him to tap the spiritual power pervading the entire world, just as one by suitable connections and switches can tap an electric current from a power circuit. Spiritual power then manifests itself in that person in the mode of moral power. The moral power is created by the spiritual power, not by the person who makes the contact, just as electric light is created not by the bulb but by the current which flows through it. So if a person becomes proud of having moral power, his understanding of the situation is badly mistaken. If a person were to get smug over training to become non-violent, he would be so mistaken about the whole matter that under provocation he would fail and would probably become violent.

Non-violent resistance is a more intelligent mode of conduct than violence, but to become proud about learning to be more intelligent in human relationships would betray immaturity and would itself be unintelligent. If, despite these considerations, some persons get priggish or proud because they are learning or have learned to use non-violent resistance habitually, it means not that the training for such skill is at fault but probably that they themselves have a tendency to that personal weakness. Perhaps the dread of acquiring such unpleasant traits through such a course of training is an expression of the prevailing secularism which puts moral relationships into a separate compartment of life.

It is true that a certain type of training might cause dogmatism or fanaticism. But that would not be peculiar to non-violence. It could happen in training for law, theology, medicine, engineering, or warfare. It would come not from the end toward which the training is directed, but from the manner of its presentation. Hence the objection can be postponed until you see or experience the discipline itself. The same considerations apply to three other alleged dangers—unpleasant uniformity, reduction of initiative, and boredom.

An objection has been raised that any definite kind of discipline would cause trouble because no two people would understand the same thing by such terms as *discipline*. But such semantic difficulties exist in all education and have to be lived through.

Some people shy away from this proposed discipline because the very idea of trying to mould one's own character makes them feel self-conscious and awkward. But they should not feel any more self-consciousness than a business man who puts a good rug and a mahogany desk in his office to remind himself and his callers, by recurring daily stimuli, that he has money and power; or than church members who build their church in Gothic style so as to inspire feelings of awe and reverence among themselves and others who enter; or than a mother who by providing curtains, rugs, and wall paper of harmonious colours and designs gives constant stimuli of beauty and serenity to her family. Deliberately and regularly subjecting oneself to stimuli chosen for a specific purpose should not make any sensible person feel foolish. We should be as objective about the training of our instincts, emotions and sentiments as we are about the training of our muscles.

Some may think that discipline and its resultant habits are incompatible with freedom. That is not so. The original decision to undergo discipline must be voluntary and without coercion. But without self-discipline and good habits nobody can have a sound character or achieve anything worth while. Even the wind, the very symbol of complete freedom, is at all times subject to the limitations and laws of aero-dynamics, of thermo-dynamics, of gravity, and other physical laws. There can be no human freedom without strict and habitual adherence to moral and intellectual principles.

Any other objections too vague to define are perhaps due only to dislike of changing one's comfortable routine, to fear of being thought queer, or to irrational suspicion

of anything that is new. People with such qualms will have to experience more suffering and do more thinking.

Since belief grows out of experience and usually requires many repetitions of the experience, we need, in order to become deeply and enduringly convinced of the validity of non-violence, to deliberately put ourselves in the way of using the method in all the small conflicts and frictions of daily existence, experiencing the reaction of other people to what we have done, comparing the results, and pondering over the matter. It is like a laboratory course in some science, or like the practice necessary to learn any art.

Each of us has some habits that are bad or at least inconsistent with non-violence. One way to end unwanted habits is to deprive them of their source of energy. This may be done by introducing competitive desirable habit formers alongside the old habits and paying special attention to the cultivation of the new habits. It is important that the new habits should have in them clearer pattern and more realized significance than the old habits. This extra pattern and significance constantly attracts the attention and imagination and thus eases the substitution. Our human nature is so blind and stubborn, we deceive ourselves so easily and constantly, our inheritance is so complex and unknown, and we are so ignorant of our true nature, that we must have training to purify and guide ourselves.

One important element and necessary accompaniment of successful non-violent resistance is the sentiment called love. Note that love is not an emotion. It is a sentiment, a specific organization of many emotions and many ideas. Love grows out of a realization of human unity. If the ideas involved in that concept are pondered for long, the appropriate emotions follow. Love is the subtlest, most developed, most inclusive, most enduring, and most powerful of all the sentiments. Its cultivation requires the greatest energy and the most

delicate and complete organization of idea and emotion. It requires steady, prolonged, purposeful thought and effort. To cultivate love requires a thorough course of self-discipline.

Of all the many different theories of the will which I have been able to study, by far the most interesting and, in my estimation, most probably correct is that of Luria, perhaps modified by an element called "identification" in the theory of Aveling.¹ Luria's theory is based on an immense number of most ingenious objective experiments. According to Luria's theory, a person controls his behaviour not by "will power" but by following a pattern of external and internal stimuli which mobilize, organize, and direct the reactions of his instincts, emotions, desires, sentiments, and other natural forces of behaviour. The control is always by such indirect means. The stimuli may include such elements as speech, rhythms, tangible tools, work, stories, music, symbols, and signs. The pattern needs to be elaborated in such clear detail and sequence that the person (according to the suggestion made by Aveling) readily sees himself able to come under the successive stimuli, finds them interesting, sees their relation to the goal and so wants not only the goal but also the series of stimuli. Such a pattern is provided by a course of training. A discipline is such a pattern. By following it the will is built up and self-control of behaviour is secured.

In his book on *Adventures of Ideas* the philosopher A. N. Whitehead pointed out the long lag that usually exists between the discovery or first statement of an idea and putting it into action.² Lancelot Hogben in his *Mathematics for the Million*³ gives several instances of that sort, one of which was the germ idea of logarithms, which was mentioned by Archimedes two centuries before the birth of Christ, but the idea was not made practical till many centuries later when Napier worked out tables of logarithms for the use of rapidly expanding navigation.

Hogben thinks that an idea is put into practical action only when there is a strongly felt social need for it. Probably that is so. But in addition to that condition, the gap between idea and action is bridged, I think, only when the idea is given detailed structure in space and a patterned sequence of elaborated detail in time. It is like the invention of a tool and the motions by which the tool is used.

Men do not learn to improve their relationships by study of history. They make an advance only when experience, thought, and imagination have eventually crystallized in the invention of a tool. The tool may be material, like a plough, or immaterial, like a concept, a symbol, or an alphabet. A material tool acts on the environment; an immaterial tool acts on man's own inner character and thus helps control his behaviour. The regular use of such a tool creates an advance without any further effort specifically aimed at such improvement.

An illustration of the gap between the birth of an idea and its practical utilization, is the history of the idea of non-violent resistance. It was first propounded in India and China, certainly as far back as 500 B.C., and perhaps even 1000 B.C. or more. Christ re-emphasized it. The early Christians used it chiefly as individuals. But in organized group form it was not used till many centuries later, and never on a very large scale before Gandhi. There is now a strongly felt social need for this idea in practice. One reason for Gandhi's success is that he devised a specific discipline for the movement. This discipline is the way by which the idea is given structure in space and a corresponding sequence of detail in time. The discipline is then, like military discipline, an intangible tool. It makes the idea effective. Steady use of this tool will make a vast improvement in human relationships.

Since, by virtue of the principle of stimulus and response, non-violent resistance will usually have to be many times repeated, it will require courage, a strong

sense of human unity, patience, ability to sacrifice oneself for a cause, ability to endure suffering alone, and to endure apparent failure and come at the obstacle again. By a course of training all these can be cultivated.

In order to bring up children into the way of non-violence there must be provided a special mode of family life and training during the formative years. This must be such as will reduce frustrations to a minimum and provide prompt and satisfying outlets for the energy of such frustrations.⁴ The child must always have an environment of steady affection and firm guidance.

If non-violent policies and practices are eventually to control society, the non-violent people must first show that the combination of inner harmony and order with outer order is better and more enduring than the mere exterior order imposed by violence and threats of violence. Non-violent people must prove themselves capable of maintaining social order. Not till then will society fully trust the method. Perhaps the prime doubt among the sceptics of non-violent resistance and love is whether that combination could really create and maintain public order. Demonstration of its actual ability in this respect will be powerfully persuasive. Non-violent people must maintain order first among themselves, and make order one of their outstanding characteristics. They must establish it in all their enterprises. This requires suitable habits, and that means discipline.

When non-violent people have acquired the cohesion and moral power that come out of deep and fine discipline, they can take over from the Government its present power of initiative.

Without discipline, that is to say, a mode of habit formation and maintenance, a group cannot win power. And without a great increase in group power you cannot attain or keep for long any social, political, or economic reforms. Mere education or organization will not permanently secure any reforms. They might be attained for a brief time without discipline, but the ruling group would

end them as soon as a big economic crisis or war should come. For example, look at what happened in Europe between 1920 and 1940. Reforms will come to stay only if the masses acquire and retain the ability to make a firm veto by mass non-violent resistance. This holds true for such proposals as the single tax, socialism, social credit, other money reforms, better education, abolition of war, decentralization, co-operation, abolition of interracial discrimination, industrial democracy, or whatever other reform you may desire. Hence, reformers would be wise to lay less stress upon advocacy of their special changes and concentrate on the teaching of non-violent resistance. Once that tool is mastered, we can make all sorts of permanent reforms.

If you want democracy or liberty you must have mutual respect and toleration under all circumstances. Mutual respect and toleration can be attained only if in all relations non-violence prevails. We cannot have non-violence a dominant feature of social, political, and industrial life without widespread propaganda and training. Hence, true and widespread democracy and liberty require training in non-violence.

Sooner or later some non-violent resisters will find themselves condemned to prison. To endure imprisonment successfully, and all the cruelty that goes with it, will need previous firm discipline.

All great military leaders and authorities on the art and science of war declare that the main strength of armies is their discipline. It is more important even than weapons. Sooner or later non-violent resisters organized in any considerable number will have to meet the armed might of the state. In order to meet disciplined troops and win against them, the non-violent resisters must have a discipline which is more thorough, deeper, more moral, and more effective than military discipline.

If a person wants to do anything that is socially valuable—for instance, to become a physician, a farmer, a dietician, or a mechanic—he cheerfully undergoes

several years of training, during which he learns a specific skill and in that respect learns to think more exactly than other people. If he really cares for his occupation, he keeps on training himself all the rest of his life. In that way he succeeds. The moral is obvious for believers in non-violence.

Unless each one of us becomes more self-controlled and skilled in human relationships, is it not vain to hope for a better world? Does each one of us expect to stay just as he is and have all the self-improvement made by other people? Is all the wrong somebody else's fault? Should everybody blame somebody else? Should everybody "pass the buck"? If we believers in non-violence refuse to change our habits in thorough fashion, that is, refuse to undergo discipline, the refusal would imply that in any conflict in which we become involved, we think the opponent is entirely in the wrong and is the only one who must change. Since we all make mistakes and do wrong things, the wrongs are never entirely on the part of the opponent. But even if in any particular conflict all the changing must be done by the opponent, to announce an assumption like that in advance would not be persuasive. A "holier than thou" attitude is always irritating and bad tactics. We who believe in non-violence must change our habits before we ask an opponent to change his.

Again, if we believers in non-violence decline to change our habits, the refusal indicates that we think we can win any struggle very easily. That is a silly miscalculation. He who makes it will practically always be defeated.

In human affairs all great changes are the result of the influence of persons on persons or of groups on groups, or rather of persons embodying one set of ideas on persons embodying another set of ideas. Before a person can influence or change another person, he must, unless a born genius, first change himself. This, of course, is true also as between groups. Marxians profess to believe that the

only important formative human influence is that of institutions, and that our efforts must be devoted entirely to changing our institutions. But the Communists in Russia took good care to kill the Czar, and the Stalinists drove Trotsky clear to Mexico and finally killed him there and then "purged" and executed a number of other former party leaders. By so doing these prominent Marxians thereby admitted the primary influential power of disciplined individual persons. Institutions are group habits of persons. Before there can be institutions there must be individual persons. A change of character or of abilities can be secured only by training and change of habits. Newton influenced other men of science only after, by hard work, he had altered his own concepts of the mechanics of the solar system. Lenin influenced other people only after a long period of thinking and self-discipline. That is true of every influential person in all history, also of every influential organization. Hence non-violent resisters in order to alter opponents must first subject themselves to self-discipline.

A person who has non-violence as one of his ideals, unless he also practices a discipline for it, will, if his country is attacked, usually end by supporting the war. This has happened to many highly intelligent pacifists such as Einstein, Bertrand Russell, and A. A. Milne. The reasons for this may be (a) that without considerable discipline his assumptions, sentiments, and habits of thought will not have changed enough to keep him steady, and so he succumbs to the herd pressure; or (b) that he fails to realize that order and liberty are not entities in their own right but are by-products of deeper conditions; or (c) he really values certain institutions more than human life. So he resigns himself to the old method of violence.

Most of the failures of campaigns of non-violent resistance have been due to inadequate discipline. This is true of many industrial strikes and of the struggles in India. In the campaigns of 1921, 1930, and 1942 the great

majority of Indian National Congressmen disregarded Gandhi's pleas for discipline. Those who desire success with non-violent resistance in any struggle had better undergo careful and prolonged discipline beforehand.

The practical effectiveness of pacifism may justifiably be doubted until the movement as a whole adopts and practises an adequate discipline.

Since the innocent common people always suffer from the mistakes and greeds of their rulers, political or economic, it is up to the innocent to control their rulers. Public affairs are so complex, the scale of political organization is so great, and daily work is so absorbing and pressing that the common man has no time to examine all proposals, make decisions, and lead in public affairs. He must delegate all that to specialists. And because of the inevitable poison of power, such delegates often become selfish or corrupt. Propaganda is pervasive and bewildering, and the machinery of voting and representation is so complex and warped that real control by the people in matters of ultimate power is by that machinery nearly impossible. The only power left to the people is the power of veto, and in ultimate matters that can be exercised effectively only by mass non-violent resistance. Hence the people must thoroughly learn this method.

Some religious organizations may feel that their present type of training is sufficient to produce effective non-violent resisters. If that were true, those organizations would have been far more influential and the method would be far more widespread and effective than it actually has been.

Because the assumptions, sentiments, concepts, and habits of large numbers of people change so gradually, the building of a non-violent civilization would, under the most favourable circumstances, require at least three generations. Those who have such a hope must establish a kind of training that can spread and last that long and develop into a permanent institution.

After the present war is what is conventionally called "over" or "ended", the reverberations of it and other long-standing and unresolved conflicts will create widespread changes, civil violence, difficult frictions and probably minor wars for years to come. To maintain as much as islands of social order in such circumstances will require love and thorough non-violence and hence intensive training.

For eventual success we shall need great leaders. If we can develop a widespread belief in the power of non-violence and some sort of effective mass discipline and practise, presently out of the large number of faithful people thereby developed, there will arise an adequate number and succession of great leaders.

CHAPTER XI

TRAINING

As training for non-violent resistance has been discussed in a number of pamphlets,¹ and as the size of this volume is limited, this chapter is brief. More space is given to other aspects of the subject.

Obviously the nature of the training will depend on the purpose for which it is to be used. The purpose is more than merely to enable people, after war has become imminent or actually has begun, to refuse to fight. To end war we must do more than that. We must remove its complex of causes and its supports. War is an inherent, inevitable, and essential element of the civilization in which we live because it is the final large-scale flowering of the domination or violence which almost all the time permeates all our human relationships. Hence our aim can be nothing short of building an entirely new civilization in which domination and violence of all kinds play a small and steadily decreasing part. We must change non-violently and deeply the motives, functions, and institutions of our whole culture.² This is indeed a task to stir people's imaginations and energies.

The training to develop people who can bring about such changes must be broad and deep. As the means to such an end it must be wholly consistent with the nature of the end. In various aspects it must be adaptable to both men and women, to children, adolescents and adults, to people of different kinds and degrees of education and of different occupations. It must give immediate satisfactions as well as prepare for the future. It must give a sense of creative activity and developing power. It must involve the exercise of our whole nature; our bodies, minds, and souls—all our senses, emotions, sentiments, will, thoughts, and ideals. It must conform with metaphysical truth or principles. It should be not rigid but capable of wide variation to suit different natures and to permit the exercise of initiative. It should be adaptable to conditions of either freedom or governmental repression. Parts of it must be practised individually, more of it socially. The social part should be designed in one form for families, in another form for small non-family groups numbering not over twelve, and in yet another form for all larger groups. Some features must be sheer good fun; all parts must be interesting and significant. So far as possible, those who take part should understand in relation to the main purpose the reasons and effects of everything they do. The different kinds of training should be practised regularly at frequent intervals—most of them at least once a week, some of them daily, a few of them annually.

In general I would recommend the following types of activity :

1. Reading and discussion.
2. Inspiration or culture of sentiments.
3. Music, preferably group singing.
4. Manual work.
5. Silent meditation.
6. Social service.
7. Practise of non-violence in small matters at all times.

8. In the thinking, culture of sentiments, and meditation, care should be taken to try to get rid of ideas, sentiments, emotions and assumptions which are divisive and inconsistent with non-violence and its practise.

Plenty of such training would develop a strong, vivid, and enduring sense of unity with all mankind, and faith in the possibilities for good in all people. It would generate self-respect, respect for others, self-reliance, self-confidence, self-control, self-sacrifice for a fine ideal. It would promote loyalty, tenacity, and steadiness of purpose. Such activities, if habitual, would foster ability to endure hardship for a common cause, and awareness of effective order and co-operation in working toward an end greater than any individual. They would create energy and courage. They would build tolerance and non-violence. They would develop equanimity and poise, patience, humility and love of truth. Training of this sort would promote, we believe, a tender-hearted kindness and love of people, which are indispensable. It would engender a strong desire for a fine social order and an ability to create and maintain it. It would help establish faith in God or induce an intellectual analysis of one's premises until one is consciously and clearly aware that one's deepest and most inclusive assumption is a unity that underlies not only all external forms and phenomena but also the entire inner world of man.

The reading may be individual and include study of articles, pamphlets, and books dealing with non-violence, peace, comparative cultures or civilizations, and the nature of man. Or there may be reading aloud in groups with subsequent discussion, or lectures or talks followed by questions and discussion. Groups may also use debates and round-table discussions. Such discursive thinking gives stimulating ideas and clear understanding, thus aiding the will and making action surer, swifter, more effective, and more enduring. It gives the interest of wrestling with important and immediate social problems.

The particular sentiments that should be cultivated have been previously mentioned. The culture of sentiments is aided by the discursive thinking already mentioned, also by seeing suitable drama. Group singing, folk dancing, eating meals together, and going on walks in groups, all create a strong sense of unity. Hearing stories of the lives and deeds of great exemplars of non-violence is important, not only for the development of desirable sentiments, but also for strengthening the will. Manual work and social service do much to complete and strengthen the organization of emotions and ideas which together constitute sentiments. Periodical commemorative celebrations, parades, ceremonies, and large meetings with addresses are also inspiring.

Music is a subtle influence but very powerful. It stirs our emotions, helps us somehow to understand our emotions, stimulates the imagination, and enriches the consciousness. Group singing gives self-assurance, vigour, unity, tolerance, and a sense of equality. It creates happiness, love of beauty, and a sense of making a significant contribution to a social group. Group singing releases and sublimates the energy of pent-up resentments or bitterness caused by frustration, injustice, or wrong, and helps to solve inner conflicts. It symbolizes and expresses feelings and sympathies which cannot be put into words or even into acts. Thus it brings about subtle and profound integrations of character, and helps to create the inner poise, serenity, and emotional order which is necessary before we can create outer peace and order.

Manual work, as well as singing and folk dancing releases, sublimates and gives desirable channels for the energy of resentments whether conscious or forgotten. Manual work develops all the fine qualities which come from military discipline, without those which are undesirable.³ It creates self-respect and self-reliance, patience and poise. For a civilization as disordered and full of inner conflict as ours is, manual work is an important therapy. It eases the moral strain of long periods of

non-violent resistance. Its realistic connection with materials keeps people's feet on the ground and restrains any possible tendency toward second rate, inexpensive mysticism.

Silent meditation may be practised either individually or in small groups. In large groups it has much less value. Some people can get little or nothing from it, and they should rely on other parts of the training. But when meditation is practised rightly, without distractions, there takes place an inner integration, a reunion between the more superficial and the deeper levels of the mind. When carried on regularly every day over a period of months there comes a silent growth of imagination and of sensibility. Silent meditation in groups subtly develops common apprehension, common sentiment, common purpose, and a deeper understanding and appreciation of the values we hold together. Individual meditation permits a search for one's assumptions, and when the relative premises have all been discovered and set aside and one finally reaches his ultimate, fundamental assumption and recognizes it as such, he sees all things more clearly and attains poise and a sense of rock-bottom sureness. Properly guided meditation helps us to become less egoistic and less selfish and facilitates communion with God. These changes in turn make easier the love of men.

Social service of many sorts is an outer expression of the inner desire for unity and good will. It completes and makes fully real the other parts of the discipline, gains reactions from other people by which to test one's beliefs, stimulates in other people a corresponding sense of unity and good will, and converts many apathetic or doubting people to the validity of the entire programme of non-violence. For its beneficiaries it frequently prevents frustrations, and thereby prevents future violence. Yet we must be careful lest such activities be taken over by governments and used, as in the case of the Red Cross, for ulterior political purposes. Also, it will not do to get so interested in social service that we make avoidable

compromises with violence, or water down or omit the other parts of the discipline.

Practice of non-violence in small ways should include such matters as always speaking in a low, calm, gentle, evenly pitched tone of voice; exercising patience, self-control and courtesy in all the little daily frictions of life; and always trusting the best in other people. Thus one tests and proves to oneself frequently the validity and effectiveness of the method and, like the coral insect, builds in tiny ways the habits which stand like a rock in the big crises.

Attitudes of which we should rid ourselves include fear, anger, so-called "righteous" indignation, pride, the desire for conventional respectability, fondness for money, and the desire for power over others.

These suggestions are only a beginning. They are an adaptation of the discipline devised and used by Gandhi, the greatest modern exemplar of the method. Every one of these suggestions has been a successful element in some established professional or cultural discipline. The sum of the different parts of such training is more moral and deeper and will become more effective than military discipline. This new discipline, like all others, will evolve and become more efficient.

At present, man is the only animal which makes organized war on its own species. To argue, as some pessimists and many militarists do, that man can never act otherwise is to assert that man is less intelligent and less capable of self-control than any other animal, most insects, or any microscopic form of life. That I cannot believe. Nor can I believe that although man has worked out a highly effective discipline for mass murder, he is incapable of evolving an effective discipline for powerful mass non-violence and its resulting mutual aid and benefit. Man, who has conquered space with his airplane and radio, and time with his language and printing, who has learned enough of the processes of life to breed vegetables and

animals with new qualities, can and will learn how to control himself and direct society to fine ends. If Occidental civilization fails at the task, it will be accomplished by the Orient.⁴

Toward the close of a life of wide, keen observation and deep, discriminative thinking Plato said in effect that persuasion is at the basis of the order of the world.⁵ Profoundly wise men of many civilizations have said in various ways that man has in him the spark and possibility of divinity. A great and successful exemplar of non-violent resistance said that we should change our minds completely, that we should seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, that the kingdom of God is at hand, and that the true followers of the spirit shall do greater things than he did. With what we now know, these words, spoken at a time when the outlook was dark, should encourage us to go forward in firm hope.

NOTES BY CHAPTERS

CHAPTER I

¹ This is based on and largely quoted from accounts by A. Fenner Brockway in his "Non-cooperation in Other Lands"—Tagore & Co., Madras, India, and his essay "Does Non-cooperation Work?", in "Pacifism in the Modern World"—ed. by D. Allen, Doubleday, Doran, New York, 1929.

² For further details see M. K. Gandhi—"Satyagraha in South Africa"—S. Ganesan, Madras, 1928; "Mahatma Gandhi—Life, Writings and Speeches"—Ganesh, Madras; "Speeches and Writings of M. K. Gandhi"—Natesan, Madras; "M. K. Gandhi" by J. J. Doke, Natesan, Madras; M. K. Gandhi—"My Experiments with Truth", Vols. I and II, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad, India, 1927, 1929; "Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas" by C. F. Andrews—Allen & Unwin, London, and Macmillan, New York, 1930; "Mahatma Gandhi"—G. A. Natesan & Co., Madras, 1930; "Mahatma Gandhi" by R. M. Gray and M. C. Parekh, Association Press, Calcutta, 1928; "Mahatma Gandhi; His Own Story" ed. by C. F. Andrews, Allen & Unwin, London, and Macmillan, New York, 1930; "Mahatma Gandhi at Work" by C. F. Andrews, Allen & Unwin, London, and Macmillan, New York, 1931; J. C. Winslow V. Elwin—"Gandhi: the Dawn of Indian Freedom"—Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, published as "The Dawn of Indian Freedom"—Allen & Unwin, London, 1931; "Gandhi the Apostle"—by H. T. Muzumdar, Chicago, Universal Press, 1923; Frederick B. Fisher—"That Strange Little Brown Man, Gandhi"—Long & Smith, New York, 1932.

³ See "My Experiments with Truth", above cited, Vol. II; the three lives of Gandhi published by Natesan and Ganesh of Madras, above cited; also Rajendra Prasad—"Satyagraha in Champaran"—Ganesan, Madras, 1929. Also the books by C. F. Andrews, above cited.

⁴ See also "Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas" by C. F. Andrews, above cited, pp. 177-179; and Winslow and Elwin, "Gandhi: the Dawn of Indian Freedom", above cited, pp. 148-151.

⁵ For the early stages of this struggle see "Essays Political and National" by S. E. Stokes, Chaps. 12 and 13—S. Ganesan, Madras, 1921.

⁶ See files of "Young India," Ahmedabad, 1928 and early 1929, for full details. Also files of Bombay and other Indian papers and

journals. Also "The Story of Bardoli" by Mahadev Desai, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad, India, 1929; Winslow and Elwin, above cited, pp. 142-144.

⁷ For detailed accounts see the files of "The Manchester Guardian" and the "Nation" (New York) for 1922 and 1923, also Savel Zimand—"Living India", Chap. 13, Longmans Green, 1928.

⁸ For description of this movement see "Young India 1919-22" Ganesan, Madras, and Huebsch, New York; Krishnadas—"Seven Months with Mahatma Gandhi"—Vol. I, Ganesan, Madras, 1928, Vol. II, Rambinode Sinha, Dighwara, Behar, India, 1928; and Savel Zimand—"Living India", Chaps. 11 and 12, above cited; "Mahatma Gandhi"—G. A. Natesan, Madras, 1930; "Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas" by C. F. Andrews, above cited; "Mahatma Gandhi" by Gray and Parekh, above cited; and Winslow and Elwin, above cited.

⁹ See Winslow and Elwin, above cited, pp. 151-170; Frederick B. Fisher, above cited, especially Chap. 4; and Haridas T. Muzumdar—"Gandhi Versus the Empire"—Universal Press, New York, 1932.

¹⁰ For other instances of the use of non-violent resistance by individuals see the lives of Buddha and Christ and records of the early Quakers and Moravians. Also Devere Allen—"The Fight for Peace"—Chaps. 22 and 23, Macmillan, 1930; C. M. Case—"Non-violent Coercion"—Century Co., New York, 1923; Adin Ballou—"Christian Non-Resistance"—2nd ed., Universal Peace Union, Philadelphia, 1910; J. H. Holmes—"New Wars for Old", Chaps. V and VI, Dodd, Mead, New York, 1916; Erica and Roderic Dunkerley—"The Arm of God"—Oliphants, Ltd., Edinburgh, 1917; William James—"Varieties of Religious Experience"—Longmans Green, 1902, p. 359; "The Test of Faith" by E. Richards, "Atlantic Monthly," Vol. 131, p. 617, May 1923; Thomas Hancock—"Principles of Peace Exemplified"—1825; Carl Heath—"Pacifism in Time of War"—Headley Bros., London, 1915; J. W. Graham—"Conscription and Conscience"—Allen & Unwin, London, 1922; D. C. Moomaw—"Christianity Versus War"—Brethren Pub. Co., Ashland, O., 1924; A. Fenner Brockway—previously cited; Norman Thomas—"Is Conscience a Crime?"—Vanguard Press, New York, 1928; W. J. Chamberlain—"Fighting for Peace"—No More War Movement, London, 1929; Edward Needes Wright—"Conscientious Objectors in the Civil War"—Univ. of Pennsylvania Press and Oxford Univ. Press 1931.

For examples of group or mass use of non-violent resistance, in addition to the Indian instances above cited, see Devere Allen—"The Fight for Peace"; C. M. Case—"Non-violent Coercion"; Adin Ballou—"Christian Non-Resistance"; J. H. Holmes—"New Wars for Old," all cited above in this note.

CHAPTER II

1 "All observers agree that it is easier and requires less courage to attack than to withstand fire without retaliation." F. C. Bartlett—"Psychology and the Soldier"—Cambridge University Press, 1927, at p. 175.

2 P. 448 of A. F. Shand's "The Foundations of Character"—Macmillan, London and New York, 1914.

3 "Don't resist when your opponent pushes you; rather increase your pace in that direction and pull him a little at the same time, or vice versa should he be pulling you. Don't let him ever get the 'strain' on you, but go with him, if anything a little faster than his pull would cause you to. By following this precept you are—if I may describe it so—almost catching your balance before he wishes you lost it, while he is practically losing his and is without the aid of your resistance—on which he has been more or less depending to help him regain his balance. Thus in an easy and simple manner you neutralize his efforts to get you off your balance and at the same time create a favourable opportunity of effecting a throw, by keeping him off his..." "Jiu-Jitsu" by Uyenishi. Athletic Publications, Ltd., London. See also article by Prof. Jigosa Kano in "Modern Review" (Calcutta) for Nov. 1922, pp. 637-638.

4 W. B. Cannon—"Bodily Changes in Pain, Hunger, Fear and Rage"—D. Appleton & Co., New York and London, 1927.

5 G. W. Crile—"Origin and Nature of the Emotions"—W. B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia and New York, 1915, especially pp. 30, 52, 61. Also W. E. Hocking—"Morale and Its Enemies"—Yale University Press, New Haven, U.S.A., 1918, at pp. 53, 54.

6 This suggests that the whole Western world, with its fondness for violence, and yet its knowledge of Christian and Buddhist ethics, is in a state of inner conflict and disintegrated personality, and needs a sort of psychoanalysis and suggestion to free it. Cf. T. Burrow—"The Social Basis of Consciousness"—Kegan Paul, London, and Harcourt Brace, New York, 1927. Perhaps this is why all modern nations, on going into war, protest that they are acting purely on the defensive.

7 I do not mean to say that the usual attitude of employers in a strike is really non-violent or necessarily even courageous.

8 Baudouin, one of the leaders of the Nancy school of psychologists, gives the two following "laws of suggestion":

"1. Law of Concentrated Attention: The idea which tends to realize itself in this way is always an idea upon which spontaneous attention is concentrated.

"2. Law of Auxiliary Emotion: When for one reason or another, an idea is enveloped in a powerful emotion there is more likelihood that this idea will be suggestively realized."

Page 143 of his "Suggestion and Auto-Suggestion", translated by Eden and Cedar Paul, Dodd, Mead & Co., New York, and Allen and Unwin, London, 1931.

⁹ Cf. W. E. Hocking—"Human Nature and Its Remaking"—2nd ed. at p. 374—Yale University Press, New Haven, U.S.A., and Oxford University Press, London, 1928.

¹⁰ Shand, loc. cit. pp. 430 and 448.

^{10a} Wm. McDougal and A. G. Tansley.

¹¹ "In modern civilization...the individual's great struggle in life is not so much a problem of self-preservation in a physical sense as it is one of attaining social approbation and potency..." "As society increases its care for the individual, and the individual for society...the individual grows more and more to need social esteem in order to feel safe and comfortable....One of the most persistent causes of anxiety and depression is the fear that he has lost prestige through a blunder or a vicious indulgence." E. J. Kempf—"Autonomic Functions and the Personality"—pp. 93, 94 and 95. Nervous and Mental Diseases Publ. Co., New York and Washington, D.C., 1921.

¹² Macmillan, London and New York, 1916.

¹³ See Clive Bell—"Civilization"—pp. 221, 222, Chatto and Windus, London, 1928; also "The Motives of the Soldier" by T. H. Proctor, 31 International Journal of Ethics, p. 26, Oct. 1920.

¹⁴ "When fear restrains the impulse of anger, in a mind capable of reflection and foresight, it tends to render anger deliberately cruel...."

"What is meant by cruelty implies enjoyment in inflicting pain, and the intention or desire to inflict it.—For this anger that is successful in attaining its end has the enjoyment of success, and, when this success coincides with the subjection of another, the enjoyment of pride.

"When fear restrains the impulse of anger, it tends to render anger at first more painful, and afterwards revengeful and cruel; as if there were a desire of inflicting suffering in revenge for the pains of fear....But when the initial and painful stage of anger is prolonged, when it is restrained by the most painful of all emotions, fear, so humiliating to pride, we can understand how the coward who dares not attack his enemy openly, or without superior advantages, broods over his revenge, and how his revenge becomes deliberate, implacable and cruel. And thus it is that cowardly men are often cruel, because the same circumstances that tend to arouse their anger tend also to arouse fear, so that there arises a constant interaction between these emotions." A. F. Shand, "The Foundations of Character"—Macmillan, London, 1914, pp. 268, 269.

¹⁵ Cf. Chap. V.

¹⁶ A. F. Shand—"The Foundations of Character," p. 448.

17 Love must be based on a knowledge of the fundamental unity of all mankind as the greatest moral truth.

18 W. E. Hocking says, "Unless I am, in fact, so much of a seer to be a lover of my enemy, it is both futile and false to assume the behaviour of love; we can generally rely on the enemy to give such conduct its true name." "Human Nature and Its Remaking," 2nd ed. p. 376, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1928.

Gandhi said to me in reference to such a situation, "If you have a sword in your bosom, take it out and use it like a man," meaning, of course, that if you really wish to injure your enemy, do it openly and courageously.

19 In "Young India" for Nov. 5, 1925, Gandhi wrote in answer to a question why he had enlisted men for service in the World War: "As a citizen not then and not even now, a reformer leading an agitation against the institution of war, I had to advise and lead men who believed in war, but who from cowardice, or from base motives or from anger against the British Government refrained from enlisting. I did not hesitate to advise them that so long as they believed in war and professed loyalty to the British constitution they were in duty bound to support it by enlistment. Though I do not believe in the use of arms, and though it is contrary to the religion of *Ahimsa* which I profess, I should not hesitate to join an agitation for a repeal of the debasing Arms Act which I have considered amongst the blackest crimes of the British Government against India. I do not believe in retaliation, but I did not hesitate to tell the villagers of Bettiah four years ago that they who knew nothing of *Ahimsa* were guilty of cowardice in failing to defend the honour of their women-folk and their property by force of arms. And I have not hesitated, as the correspondent should know, only recently to tell the Hindus that if they do not believe in out-and-out *Ahimsa* and cannot practise it, they will be guilty of a crime against their religion and humanity if they fail to defend by force of arms the honour of their women against any kidnapper who chooses to take away their women."

20 The instances where the non-violent resister gets killed or starved during the struggle are discussed in subsequent chapters. Also the cases where censorship hides or propaganda falsifies the report of events.

CHAPTER III

1 W. H. R. Rivers — "Instinct and the Unconscious" — Cambridge University Press and Macmillan, New York, 1920, p. 93.

2 W. Trotter — "Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War," P. 82, Macmillan, London and New York, 1916.

³ See C. Baudouin—"Suggestion and Auto-Suggestion," above cited. Also *ibid*—"Educating the Will"—*Century Magazine*, New York, July, 1929.

⁴ Cf. T. Burrow—"The Social Basis of Consciousness" Kegan Paul, London, and Harcourt Brace, New York, 1927.

⁵ At pp. 91-92 of his book above cited.

⁶ Edward Alsworth Ross—"Social Psychology"—Macmillan, New York, 1909, at pp. 120, 126, 130, 136. Cf. also Gabriel Tarde—"The Laws of Imitation"—Chap. 6—Trans. by E. C. Parsons, Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1903.

⁷ At p. 30 "Autonomic Functions and the Personality."

⁸ At p. 78.

⁹ Von Clausewitz—"On War"—Trans. by Col. J. J. Graham, Kegan Paul, London, 1911, E. P. Dutton, New York, 1914, Vol. I, p. 99.

¹⁰ Translated—Hugh Rees, Ltd., London, 1905, at p. 78.

¹¹ Perhaps further light may be thrown on all this by further study of unconscious mental processes and their relation to the conscious. Cf. "The Psychology of Emotion" by John T. MacCurdy—Kegan Paul, London, and Harcourt, Brace, New York, 1925.

¹² Von Clausewitz says, "A hostile feeling is kindled by the combat itself; for an act of violence which anyone commits upon us by order of his superior will excite in us a desire to retaliate and be revenged on him, sooner than on the superior power at whose command the act was done. This is human, or animal if we will, still it is so. We are very apt to regard the combat in theory as an abstract trial of strength, without any participation on the part of the feelings, and that is one of the thousand errors which theorists deliberately commit, because they do not see its consequences." "On War"—Kegan Paul, London, 1911, E. P. Dutton, New York, 1914, Vol. I, p. 102.

¹³ Cf. W. B. Pillsbury and C. L. Meade—"The Psychology of Language," p. 6—D. Appleton & Co., New York and London, 1928. Also E. S. Bogardus—"Fundamentals of Social Psychology," p. 114—Century Co., New York and London, 1924.

¹⁴ See C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards—"The Meaning of Meaning," 2d. ed. rev. Kegan Paul, London, Harcourt, Brace, New York, 1927, especially chapters on "Sign Situations" and "Symbol Situations." Also, I. A. Richards—"Principles of Literary Criticism," Chap. 21—*ibid*, 1926.

¹⁵ This hypothesis of the non-violent resister may be compared with the various fruitful fictions described in "The Philosophy of 'As If'" by H. Vaihinger, trans. by C. K. Ogden—Kegan Paul, London, and Harcourt, Brace, New York, 1924.

^{15a} Cf. "Religious Conversion" by Sante de Sanctis, Kegan Paul, London, and Harcourt, New York, 1927.

15b Cf. I. A. Richards — "Principles of Literary Criticism" — Harcourt, New York, and Kegan Paul, London.

16 W. H. R. Rivers — "Instinct and the Unconscious" — Cambridge University Press and Macmillan, New York, 1920. Page 54.

17 Cf. Miss M. P. Follett — "Creative Experience", p. 62, Longmans Green, New York, 1924; cf. also E. B. Holt — "Ethics of the Freudian Wish" — Holt & Co., New York, 1915, Chap. 3; also his "Concept of Consciousness".

18 Longmans Green, New York, 1924, p. 157 et seq.

19 See page 171 of Miss Follett's book.

CHAPTER IV

1 Cf. John Dewey — "Force and Coercion" — 26 International Journal of Ethics, pp. 360-367, April, 1916.

2 Cf. Crile and Hocking previously cited.

3 See W. M. Marston — "Emotions of Normal People" — Kegan Paul, London, and Harcourt, Brace, New York, 1928, Chap. 17.

4 "Mechanisms of Character Formation", Macmillan, New York, 1916, p. 274. See also pp. 73 and 278.

5 I do not mean to assert that all psychological repression is harmful. For example, temporary self-repression is involved in all training and discipline and probably acts to provide, as it were, a certain pressure of energy which is useful in carving out new channels of action in the direction marked out by the training.

6 Cf. Marston, above cited, pp. 160-169, Chap. 13, and pp. 377-379.

7 Goethe.

8 See p. 125, chapter on Habit in his "Principles of Psychology", Vol. I, Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1893.

9 Cf. "India and the Simon Report" by C. F. Andrews, Allen & Unwin, London, and Macmillan, New York, 1930.

10 At pp. 188-191.

11 W. Trotter in his "Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War," Macmillan, London and New York, 1916, pp. 123, 125.

CHAPTER V

1 Cf. A. F. Shand "The Foundations of Character", Macmillan Co., London and New York, 1914, at pp. 214, 216-217, 250, and Chap. 3, Sec. 1. Also E. J. Kempf. "The Autonomic Functions and the Personality," Nervous and Mental Disease Publ. Co., New York and Washington, D. C., 1921, pp. 79, 80, 82.

Cf. in accord the "dominance-compliance" concept in "Emotions of Normal People", Wm. M. Marston, International Library of Psychology, Philosophy and Scientific Method, Kegan Paul, London, and Harcourt, Brace, New York, 1928; and in "Integrative Psychology" by W. M. Marston, C. D. King and E. H. Marston, same publishers, 1931.

² Kempf, above cited.

³ Cf. also G. W. Crile—"Origin and Nature of the Emotions"—W. B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia, 1915. "This common basis or origin of fear and anger may be one reason why it is impossible to make a valid distinction between aggressive and defensive war nowadays. Cf. W. L. Crane—"The Passing of War"—Macmillan, London, 1912; C. C. Morrison—"The Outlawry of War"—Willett, Clark & Colby, Chicago, 1927.

⁴ The doubt in the minds of many leaders and academically educated people that unlearned people could not easily understand non-violent resistance and discipline themselves to it, is unfounded. The great majority of Indians who have used it under Gandhi's leadership have been illiterate peasantry. And in the West, industrial strikes, which have been predominantly non-violent, have been conducted mostly by people with no great amount of schooling.

⁵ I. P. Pavlov—"Lectures on Conditioned Reflexes"—International Publishers, New York, 1928.

⁶ J. B. Watson—"The Heart or the Intellect"—Harper's Monthly Magazine, Feb. 1926; also, J. B. Watson—"Behaviourism"—People's Institute Publishing Co., New York, 1925.

⁷ "The Motives of the Soldier"—by T. H. Proctor, 31 International Journal of Ethics 26, at p. 36. (Oct. 1920.)

⁸ Lt.-Col L. C. Andrews—"Military Manpower", E. P. Dutton & Co., New York 1920, p. 17.

⁹ Foch—"Principles of War"—American ed., H. K. Fly Co., New York, 1918, p. 99.

¹⁰ Cf. William James' chapter on Habit, in his "Principles of Psychology".

¹¹ Sir George Lloyd, at that time Governor of the Bombay Presidency, in an interview with Mr. Drew Pearson, is reported to have said:

"He gave us a scare! His programme filled our jails. You can't go on arresting people forever, you know—not when there are 319,000,000 of them. And if they had taken his next step and refused to pay taxes! God knows where we would have been.

"Gandhi's was the most colossal experiment in world history; and it came within an inch of succeeding. But he couldn't control men's passions. They became violent and he called off his programme". Quoted from article by C. F. Andrews—"The Coming Crisis in India"—in the "New Republic", New York, April 3, 1929.

¹² Cf. Ernest Toller—"Man and the Masses" (Masse Mensch) trans. by L. Untermeyer—Doubleday, Page & Co., New York, 1924.

¹³ "Passive resistance, if it were adopted deliberately by the will of the whole nation, with the same measure of courage and discipline which is now displayed, might achieve a far more perfect

protection for what is good in national life than armies and navies can ever achieve, without demanding the carnage and waste and welter of brutality involved in modern war." B. Russell—"War and Non-Resistance"—116 *Atlantic Monthly* 266 (Aug. 1915), Boston, U.S.A., reprinted in his book "Justice in War Time"—Allen & Unwin, London, Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago, 1924.

CHAPTER VI

¹ In his book "The Principles of War", American ed. trans. by Major J. de Morinni—H. K. Fly Co., New York, 1918, at p. 316 (reference is to pages in American ed.), English ed. trans. by H. Belloc. French ed. Berger-Levrault, Paris, 1917.

² Sir Ian Hamilton—"The Soul and Body of the Army"—p. 134. Edw. Arnold, London, 1921.

³ Lt.-General von Caemmerer—"The Development of Strategical Science"—Trans. Publ. by Hugh Rees, Ltd., London, 1905.

⁴ Major General Sir F. Maurice—"British Strategy", p. 67, above cited.

⁵ "The Real War"—by Captain B. H. Liddell Hart, p. 506, Faber & Faber, London; Little, Brown, Boston, 1930.

⁶ W. E. Hocking—"Morale and Its Enemies"—Yale University Press, New Haven, U.S.A., 1918, p. 151.

⁷ See Hocking—"Morale and Its Enemies"; F. C. Bartlett—"Psychology and the Soldier"—Cambridge University Press, 1927; Lieut.-Col. L. C. Andrews—"Military Manpower" (Psychology of Military Training) E. P. Dutton & Co., New York, 1920; H. G. Lord—"The Psychology of Courage"—Luce & Co., Boston, Mass, 1918; Sir Ian Hamilton—"The Soul and Body of the Army"—Edward Arnold, London, 1921. Also an article by Bt. Lieut.-Col. L. V. Bond, R. E. General Staff, on "The Principles of Field Service Regulations" in the *Journal of the United Service Institution of India* for July, 1921, Simla, India.

⁸ For the moment we will defer the case of a massacre due to the commander of the troops losing his head or using undue terrorism. That will be discussed later.

⁹ Rivers—"Instinct and the Unconscious", p. 219, also 211-212. During the First World War, Rivers was on the staff of a British hospital for treating shell shock and other nervous diseases of soldiers.

¹⁰ Von Clausewitz—"On War"—trans. by Col. J. J. Graham, Kegan Paul, London, 1911, E. P. Dutton, New York, 1914, Vol. I, p. 99; Von Caemmerer—"Development of Strategical Science"—trans. Hugh Rees, Ltd., London, 1905, at p. 78.

11 T. H. Proctor—"The Motives of the Soldier"—31 International Journal of Ethics, p. 26 (Oct. 1920). In accord see Rivers—"Instinct and the Unconscious", pp. 210, 211, 213.

12 H. C. Lord—"The Psychology of Courage", p. 150, above cited.

13 Hocking—"Morale and Its Enemies"—p. 99, previously cited.

14 "Military Manpower", p. 175, above cited.

15 F. C. Bartlett—"Psychology and the Soldier"—Cambridge University Press, 1927, pp. 172-175; Hocking—"Morale and Its Enemies", p. 159, previously cited.

16 Cf. the near mutiny of English soldiers occupying the Ruhr after the war but while the starvation blockade of Germany was still in effect.

17 Cf. the conclusions of Sir F. Maurice as to the undesirability of gas war and bombing civilians from airplanes, in his "British Strategy", Chap. 9, above cited. Cf. also a letter on "Police of the Air" by A. T. Wilson in the "London Times", May 7, 1930. An article by Hoffman Nickerson in the "New York Times" for February 21, 1932, contains the following pertinent passages: "Frightfulness, unless it prove an immediate and overwhelming success, has shown itself the worst sort of boomerang....It is true that when one is dealing with barbarians or helpless Chinese the political disadvantages of frightfulness are less. But even when it is employed against barbarians the disadvantages are there. The great French Marshal Lyautey, the conqueror and organizer of Morocco, strictly limited the use of the airplane against the natives. In the long run, he said, he wanted them willingly to consent to French rule. *Want of Discrimination*—Bombing of villages from the air hindered rather than helped his purpose because the airplane bomb is an indiscriminating weapon which might injure the best friends of the French in any given village. Furthermore, the Moroccans, having no planes themselves, thought their use unsportsmanlike. Lyautey therefore insisted that beating them in what they consider a fairer fashion was more apt to persuade them to peace and contentment." Reprinted in his book—"Can We Limit War?" Chap. 9, F. A. Stokes Co., New York, 1934.

18 In an article called "Armament and Its Future Uses", in the "Yale Review" (New Haven), for July, 1930, at p. 652.

19 Gandhi's visit to London for the second Round Table Conference may prove to have been a disturbance to the previous solidity of British opinion and purpose in relation to India.

20 At pp. 448, 378 of Shand's book, cited in Chap. II.

20a Cf. the Indian hunter who taught his son always to make a warning noise just before shooting at game, saying, "When you give warning you have asserted the superiority of your nerves over your adversary's, and that is half the battle won." "Hari, the Jungle Lad"—by D. G. Mukerji, E. P. Dutton, New York.

²¹ "Chivalry, in the broadest sense of the word, is the cultivation of respect in an enemy for or by his opponent....The side which, in war, first attains a superiority in chivalry is the side which attains a spiritual victory over its enemy, a victory which normally not only precedes a material success but which wins the ethical objective of war, which is the true foundation of the peace which follows it....As the military object of war is to defeat the enemy, and as the economic object is to add to the prosperity of the nation, so'is the ethical object to enhance the national character, that is, to increase its respect in the eyes not only of the enemy but of neutral nations. A man who fights cleanly is always applauded even if he lose; consequently, under certain circumstances, it is even more important to win the ethical objective than the military one." Pp. 70 and 64 of Col. J. F. C. Fuller's "Reformation of War", Hutchinson & Co., London, 1923, and E. P. Dutton & Co., New York.

^{21a} Just after his release from prison on May 8, 1933, at the beginning of his twenty-one day fast, Gandhi was reported by the press to have said, in reference to the decline in effectiveness of the civil disobedience movement at that time: "I have nothing but praise for the bravery and self-sacrifice of the numerous civil resisters, but having said that, I cannot help saying that the secrecy that has attended the movement is fatal to its success. If, therefore, the movement must be continued, I would urge those who are guiding the movement in different parts of the country to discard all secrecy. I do not care if thereby it becomes difficult to secure a single civil resister. There can be no doubt that fear has seized the common mass. The Ordinances have cowed them down and I am inclined to think that the secret methods are largely responsible."

Again, in his long statement of reasons for the renewal of individual civil disobedience, issued at Ahmedabad on July 27, 1933, Gandhi is reported to have said in regard to secret methods: "There is nothing inherently wrong in them. I fully admit the purity of purpose and the great cleverness of the workers in conducting the campaign of secret methods, devised to meet the situation created by repressive measures of Government. But secrecy is repugnant to Satyagraha and hampers its progress. It has undoubtedly contributed in a great measure to the present demoralization of the people. I know that a ban on secrecy will stop some of the activities which appear to keep the Congress before the public eye. But this doubtful benefit will be outweighed by the certain elimination of a method which is foreign to the spirit of Satyagraha and which interferes with its efficiency."

²² See Col. Fuller's book, above cited, at p. 95.

²³ See "Englishmen, Frenchmen, Spaniards, an Essay in Comparative Psychology" by Salvador de Madariaga, pp. 27 and 58. Oxford University Press, London, 1928.

²⁴ Cf. "The Motives of the Soldier" by T. H. Proctor, 31 Int. J. of Ethics 26, at p. 34, Oct. 1920.

²⁵ Salvador de Madariaga—"Disarmament", p. 60, Oxford University Press, London, 1929, Coward-McCann, Inc., New York.

²⁶ "The Reformation of War" by Col. J. F. C. Fuller, D.S.O., p. 46; above cited.

²⁷ Cf. C. F. Andrews—"India and the Simon Commission"—Macmillan, 1930.

²⁸ Von Clausewitz—"On War", Vol. III, p. 209.

²⁹ See A. Ponsonby—"Falsehood in Wartime"—E. P. Dutton, New York, 1928; Irene Cooper Willis—"England's Holy War", A. Knopf, New York, 1928; Caroline E. Playne—"Society at War"—Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1931; Will Irwin—"The Art of Muddlement"—Scribner's Magazine, New York, Oct. 1929.

³⁰ See Robert Hunter—"Violence and the Labour Movement", pp. 110-120, Macmillan, New York, 1914.

³¹ See instances cited by William James—"Varieties of Religious Experience"—Longmans Green, 1902, p. 359; C. M. Case—"Non-Violent Coercion"—pp. 242-248, Century Co., New York, 1923; Adin Ballou—"Christian Non-Violence", pp. 146-169—Universal Peace Union, Philadelphia, 1910; see also "The Arm of God", Oliphants Ltd., London; "The Test of Faith" by E. Richards, Vol. 131, "Atlantic Monthly", p. 617.

CHAPTER VII

¹ The Irish poet, George Russell (AE) in his book "The National Being" (Macmillan, 1916, p. 127) says "We must admit that military genius has discovered and applied with mastery a law of life which is of the utmost importance to civilization—far more important to civil even than to military development—and that is the means by which the individual will forget his personal danger and sacrifice life itself for the general welfare. In no other organization will men in great masses so entirely forget themselves as men will in battle under military discipline....The military discipline works miracles."

² "Atlantic Monthly", Boston, for August, 1928, quotations are from pp. 181 and 182. Captain B. H. Liddell Hart, the British writer on military strategy, says that to prepare for peace you must understand war.

³ See article on "Air Power" by A. A. Walser in "The Nineteenth Century and After" for April, 1923, p. 598.

⁴ See also the British Field Service Regulations, Part II. But cf. criticisms of Foch on this point in "Foch: The Man of Orleans" by Captain M. H. Liddell Hart, Eyre & Spottiswood, London, 1931; Little, Brown, Boston, U. S. A., 1932.

⁵ See Foch — "Principles of War" previously cited, p. 318.

If any readers feel that in what follows I am guilty of repetition, let me quote the words of a famous teacher of the piano, Tobias Matthay: "While reiteration may be resented by the casual reader, it is imperative for the true student. It is only by repetition of the same point under various aspects that facts are eventually brought home and grasped, and the vision of the whole not lost sight of in pursuit of the details of the structure. A genius may not need such treatment; he may see things in a flash of intelligence... A work of the present nature, however, is designed as an endeavour to help the ordinary worker and seeker after truth; the genius, himself, may also save years of time and feel surer of his ground by taking the trouble to master the facts thus intellectually, as well as by intuition." — "The Visible and Invisible: An Epitome of the Laws of Pianoforte Technique", Oxford University Press, London.

⁶ Von Clausewitz — "On War" — previously cited, Vol. III, p. 210. Captain B. H. Liddlell Hart writes that it is "the experience of all history that, except against an exhausted or already demoralized foe, decisive success in war is only possible through surprise" — "The Real War", p. 446, Faber & Faber, London; Little, Brown, Boston, 1930. See also "Nelson's Letters and Dispatches", Vol. IV, p. 295, Letter of March 24, 1801. Also the prize essay of the Royal United Service Institution for 1928, by Lieut.-Commander J. D. Prentice, Journal of Royal United Service Institution, May 1929, Whitehall, London, pp. 235, 237, 239.

⁷ Napoleon's "Maxims of War" — Maxim XVI.

⁸ Sir Ian Hamilton — "The Soul and Body of the Army" — p. 134, Edward Arnold, London, 1921.

⁹ Cf. Chaps. II to IV.

¹⁰ See his "Principles of War", p. 316.

^{10a} A British psychologist argues that the fundamental reasons for war are sadism and masochism, and that until somehow those allegedly deep-seated urges are modified war cannot be ended. If we were to take his argument at its face value, I would say that in so far as sadism and masochism are perverted expressions of a desire for power, non-violent resistance can control them by substituting its own method of securing a power that is greater and more satisfying. The energy and unifying power of the method will also straighten out the other perversions involved in sadism and masochism. See "War, Sadism and Pacifism" by Edward Glover, Allen & Unwin, London, 1933.

¹¹ "Principles of War", p. 32.

CHAPTER VIII

¹ E. g., F. Oppenheimer, H. J. Laski, W. E. Hocking, G. B. Shaw, Spengler, Mommsen, Tolstoi, Veblen, John Dewey, von Clausewitz, Lenin, Admiral A. T. Mahan, Sigmund Freud, in his "Reflections on War and Death", trans. by Brill and Kuttner, Moffat Yard, New York, 1918.

² Fear, even when used by governments to enlist popular support of a war, may become a boomerang and impair individual efficiency as well as group morale.

³ Von Clausewitz wrote that "war is a part of political intercourse" and "war is only a continuation of State policy by other means"—von Clausewitz "On War", previously cited, Vol. I, p. xxviii and Vol. III, p. 121. De Madariaga agrees, saying, "The army and navy are but the military wing of the nation's diplomacy. In normal times the foreign secretary carries on the war.—Armaments appear to us as instruments of policy. They are indeed the most important instrument of policy, together with financial power." See his "Disarmament", above cited, pp. 59, 60.

⁴ I am not here considering the police.

⁵ The great Indian philosopher, Aurobindo Ghose, in his book "War and Self-Determination" (publ. by S. Ghose, Calcutta, 1922) writes:

"So long as war does not become psychologically impossible, it will remain, or, if banished for a while, return. War itself, it is hoped, will end war; the expense, the horror, the butchery, the disturbance of tranquil life, the whole confused sanguinary madness of the thing has reached or will reach such colossal proportions that the human race will fling the monstrosity behind it in weariness and disgust. But weariness and disgust, horror and pity, even the opening of the eyes to reason by the practical facts of the waste of human life and energy and the harm and extravagance are not permanent factors; they last only while the lesson is fresh. Afterwards, there is forgetfulness; human nature recuperates itself and recovers the instincts that were temporarily dominated... War is no longer, perhaps, a biological necessity, but it is still a psychological necessity; what is within must manifest itself outside.

"...Only when man has developed not merely a fellow-feeling with all men, but a dominant sense of unity and commonalty, only when he is aware of them not merely as brothers,—that is a fragile bond,—but as parts of himself, only when he has learned to live, not in his separate personal and communal ego-sense, but in a large universal consciousness, can the phenomenon of war, with whatever weapons, pass out of his life without the possibility of return."

This opinion is in substance echoed by Bertrand Russell. He writes in an article, "What I Believe" in the "Forum" (New York) for Sept. 1929:

"The supposed economic causes of war, except in the case of certain capitalistic enterprises, are in the nature of a rationalization; people wish to fight, and they therefore persuade themselves that it is to their interest to do so. The important question, then, is the psychological one—'Why do people wish to fight?' And this leads on from war to a host of other questions concerning impulses to cruelty and oppression in general. These questions in their turn involve a study of the origins of the malevolent passions, and thence of psychoanalysis and the theory of education....

"The basis of international anarchy is man's proneness to fear and hatred. This is also the basis of economic disputes; for the love of power, which is at their root, is generally an embodiment of fear."

⁶ Cf. Wm. McDougal—"Janus, or the Future of War"—Kegan Paul, London, and E. P. Dutton, New York, 1927. Also Major Sherman Miles—"The Problem of the Pacifist", 217 North American Review 312, March, 1923.

⁷ Reinhold Niebuhr—"A Critique of Pacifism"—139 Atlantic Monthly 637, May 1927, Boston, U.S.A.

⁸ In his "Democracy, Pacifism and Imperialism", pp. 196, 197 of "The Proletarian Revolution in Russia" by N. Lenin and L. Trotsky, ed. by L. Frama, The Communist Press, New York, 1918.

⁹ See "The Soviet Union and Peace"—Martin Lawrence, Ltd., London, 1929.

¹⁰ De Madariaga—"Disarmament", pp. 42, 45, 48, 56, 61, 198. But this need not mean a super-State with supremely powerful armed forces. As soon as one nation organize itself for non-violent resistance and wins an international struggle by those tactics, there will be imitators, and our present international relationships will change completely.

¹¹ See "Diversification of Crops" by C. Y. Shepard, Vol. II, No. 5, "Tropical Agriculture", Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture, St. Augustine, Trinidad, B.W.I.

¹² "Land Tenure and Unemployment"—Frank Geary, Allen & Unwin, London, 1925.

¹³ Cf. H. J. Laski—"Aristocracy Still the Ruling Class in England"—Current History, New York, July, 1930.

¹⁴ See "English Prisons under Local Government"—by Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Longmans Green, London, 1927; "English Prisons Today—Being a Report of the Prison System Enquiry Committee"—edited by S. Hobhouse and A. F. Brockway—Longmans

Green, London, 1922; "Penology in the United States"—by L. N. Robinson, J. C. Winston Co., Philadelphia, 1923; "Probation and Delinquency" by E. J. Cooley—Nelson, New York, 1927; T. M. Osborne—"Society and Prisons"—Yale University Press, 1916; Ibid.—"Prisons and Common Sense"—1924; G. B. Shaw—"Imprisonment"—Brentano, New York, 1925, now by Dodd, Mead & Co., New York (a reprint of his introduction to "English Prisons under Local Government", supra); Frank Tannenbaum—"Wall Shadows"—Putnam, New York, 1922; Wm. Healy—"The Individual Delinquent"—1915, New York; Donald Lowmes—"My Life in Prison"; Al Jennings—"Through the Shadows with O. Henry"; F. R. Johnson—"Probation for Juveniles and Adults"; G. Godwin—"Cain or the Future of Crime"—Kegan Paul, London, and E. P. Dutton, N. Y., 1929; "Handbook of American Prisons", 1926, Putnam, New York; J. O. Stutzman—"Curing the Criminal"—Macmillan, New York, 1926; F. C. Bartlett—"Psychology and the Soldier"—Cambridge University Press, 1927, p. 124; R. N. Baldwin—"Pacifism and the Criminal"—in D. Allen's "Pacifism in the Modern World," Doubleday Doran, New York, 1929; L. E. Lawes—"Life and Death in Sing Sing"—Doubleday, Doran & Co., New York and London, 1929; Margaret Wilson, "The Crime of Punishment"—Jonathan Cape, London, Harcourt Brace, New York, 1931; Clarence Darrow—"Resist Not Evil"—Haldeman-Julius, Girard, Kansas, U.S.A.; "Kropotkin's Revolutionary Pamphlets"—ed. by R. N. Baldwin, Vanguard Press, New York, 1927; "The Morality of Punishment" by A. C. Ewing, Kegan Paul, London, 1929; "The Death Penalty Enquiry",—A Review of the Evidence before the Select Committee on Capital Punishment, by E. Roy Calvert, Gollancz, London, 1929; "Taming the Criminal" by John Lewis Gillin, Macmillan, New York, 1931.

One of the ablest brief statements of the whole problem is G. B. Shaw's "Imprisonment", cited above. It dodges none of the hard facts, indulges in no sentiment, is inclusive in scope, is short, courageous and cogent. He has studied the subject very thoroughly as a member of the British Prison System Enquiry Committee. His statement is so clear and compact that I cannot forbear quoting two paragraphs from his recapitulation:

"3. The prison authorities profess three objects: (a) retribution (a euphemism for vengeance), (b) deterrance (a euphemism for terrorism), and (c) reform of the prisoner. They achieve the first by simple atrocity. They fail in the second through lack of the necessary certainty of detection, prosecution and conviction; partly because their methods are too cruel and mischievous to secure the co-operation of the public; partly because the prosecutor is put to serious inconvenience and loss

of time; partly because most people desire to avoid an unquestionable family disgrace much more than to secure a very questionable justice; and partly because the proportion of avowedly undetected crimes is high enough to hold out reasonable hopes to the criminal that he will never be called to account. The third (reform) is irreconcilable with the first (retribution); for the figures of recidivism and the discovery that the so-called Criminal Type is really a prison type, prove that the retribution process is one of uncompensated deterioration.

"4. The cardinal vice of the system is the anti-Christian vice of vengeance, or the intentional duplication of malicious injuries partly in pure spite, partly in compliance with the expiatory superstition that two blacks make a white. The criminal accepts this, but claims that punishment absolves him if the injuries are equivalent, and still more if he has the worse of the bargain, as he almost always has. Consequently, when absolution on his release is necessarily denied him, and he is forced back into crime by the refusal to employ him, he feels that he is entitled to revenge this injustice by becoming an enemy of society...."

(Recidivism means criminals returning to jail for subsequent offences. By the phrase "prison type" Shaw means a type created by the prison environment.)

Shaw also remarks, "The effect of revenge, or retribution from without, is to destroy the conscience of the aggressor instantly."

¹⁵ See "The Defective, Delinquent and Insane" by Henry A. Cotton, M.D., and his 1933 report as Medical Director and Director of Research of the New Jersey State Hospital. See also "Biochemistry and Mental Phenomena" by Joseph Needham, an Appendix in "The Creator Spirit" by C. E. Raven, Martin Hopkinson, London, 1927, pp. 296-299.

¹⁶ Perhaps even psychiatry itself needs reform for this purpose. See T. Burrow—"The Social Basis of Consciousness", previously cited.

¹⁷ See E. Richards—"The Test of Faith"—131 Atlantic Monthly 617; "The Arm of God"—Oliphants, Ltd., London, pp. 56, 142-151, 159. It is interesting to recall that Christ used non-violent methods when he dealt with an insane boy.

¹⁸ Cf. the conduct of the Abbe toward the thief in Victor Hugo's "Les Misérables".

¹⁹ See collection of Gandhi's writings entitled "Young India, 1919-1922", pp. 1116, 1117, 1118, 1120-22, 1125—Ganesan, Madras, also B. W. Huebsch, New York. Also the article "Some Rules of Satyagraha" in his paper Young India for Feb. 27, 1930.

CHAPTER IX

¹ Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th Ed., article entitled "Hormones"; and "Homeopathic Principles in Therapeutics" by T. H. McGavack, Boericke & Tafel, Philadelphia, 1932. Also see Fischer and Penzoldt; Liebig's Annals, 238, 135, 1887; and article on "Smell and Taste" in Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th Ed.

² See "Irritability" by Max Verworn, Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1913, pp. 209 to 234.

³ See the summary of reports of such experiments (with references to date and place of first publication) in "A Study of the Simile Principle in Medicine" by L. J. Boyd, M.D., Boericke & Tafel, Philadelphia, 1936, especially pp. 326 to 361. Also Verworn, above cited, pp. 42, 43, 61.

⁴ Boyd, above cited pp. 335-361. Also Verworn, above cited, pp. 42, 43, 61, 62, 218.

⁵ Boyd, above cited, pp. 335-361.

⁶ See "Prisoners and Common Sense", by Thomas Mott Osborne (former Warden at Auburn and Sing Sing Prisons, New York), Lippincott, Philadelphia, 1924; "The Criminal as a Human Being" by George S. Dougherty (former Deputy Commissioner and Chief of Detectives, New York), D. Appleton & Co., New York and London, 1924; "500 Criminal Careers" by S. and E. T. Glueck, Knopf, New York, 1930; "A Psychological and Educational Survey of 1916 Prisoners in the Western Pennsylvania Penitentiary of Pennsylvania" by William T. Root, Jr., published by the Board of Trustees of that prison, 1927; "Criminology" by Robert H. Gault (Editor of the Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology), D. C. Heath & Co., New York, 1932; "The Offenders" by Burdette G. Lewis (Commissioner of Correction, City of New York), Harper Bros., New York, 1917; "Curing the Criminal" by Jesse O. Stutsman (General Superintendent of Rockview Penitentiary, Bellefonte, Pennsylvania), Macmillan, New York, 1926; "I Knew Them in Prison" by Mary B. Harris, Viking Press, New York, 1936; "Sing Sing Doctor" by Amos O. Squire, M.D., Doubleday Doran, New York, 1935; "Penal Discipline" by Mary Gordon (Late H. M. Inspector of Prisons), George Routledge & Sons, London, 1922; "Taming the Criminal" by John Lewis Gillin (Professor of Sociology, University of Wisconsin), New York, 1931.

⁷ See "The Social Life of Animals" by W. C. Allee, Norton, New York, 1938.

⁸ Cf. A. N. Whitehead "Adventures of Ideas," Macmillan, New York, 1933, pp. 105, 108, 31, 53, 205.

⁹ See "The Source of Civilization" by Gerald Heard.

¹⁰ "Over the Carnage Rose Prophetic a Voice."

¹¹ This is clearly and interestingly shown by many experiments in Gestalt psychology. See the books by Koffka and Kohler; "A

NOTES BY CHAPTERS

Source Book of Gestalt Psychology" edited by W. D. Ellis, Harcourt, New York, 1938, Kegan Paul, London; "The Science of Psychology" by R. H. Wheeler, Crowell, New York, 1929; "Principles of General Psychology" by Ellis Freeman, Holt, New York, 1939.

11a The processes of persuasion are both subtle and complex. We can realize better how complex they are if we make a list of some of the factors which undoubtedly take part in initiating, influencing, or determining actions. Bodily condition, for example, is one of these. If one is sick, he will not undertake certain actions, or if he does he will usually do them poorly, or be unable to persist long, or maybe his judgment will be poor. One's emotions initiate or influence certain types of action. If he is hungry he acts one way; if fearful, another; if happy, still another. Some influential factors are:

- assumptions
- perceptions
- knowledge
- sentiments
- prejudices
- beliefs

- hopes
- affections and loyalties
- conflicts of loyalties
- desires
- conflicts of desires

- trust
- love of truth
- persistence
- habits
- foresight

- planning ability
- economic motives
- flexibility in interpretations
- or in fresh integrations
- of meaning

In order to persuade an opponent, one must use powers which will alter a controlling portion of the foregoing factors in him in such a way as to result in a more fully realized unity of purpose and energy than before.

Space in this edition is too limited to permit detailed analysis of the comparative effects of violence and non-violence on each of the above-listed factors entering into persuasion. But as one brief instance, careful psychological studies have shown that even bare perceptions have in them an element of interpretation. Walking along the road in the twilight, a calm person will see in the roadway a bit of old rope, while a nervous person will see in the same place

- formal training
- intellectual energy
- ability to coordinate ideas with action
- past experience
- sense of probability
- judgment
- imagination
- speed, range, clearness, and depth of intelligence
- desire for consistency
- desire for order
- clearness of ideas of order
- speed and ease of learning
- one's picture of oneself and desire to play the part
- egoism
- accuracy, detail, range, and duration of memory

a snake. Kindness and non-violence help to create states of mind and feeling which promote true interpretations and perceptions. In various places we have suggested how such analysis may be made, and must leave the actual making of them to the reader's imagination. But it is safe to say that in relation to the welfare of society and co-operative action among its members, a sense of unity, gentle kindness, and non-violent resistance to evil affect every one of the above-named factors favourably. On the other hand, violence and coercion affect every one of them unfavourably. Non-violence promotes co-operation for social benefit; coercion decreases such co-operation. Non-violence and love are persuasive.

¹² See pp. 24, 28 above.

¹³ See "Personal Aggressiveness and War" by E. F. M. Durbin and J. Bowlby, Kegan Paul, London, 1939, and Columbia University Press, New York, 1940.

¹⁴ See "Personal Aggression and War" above cited and "Frustration and Aggression" by Dollard, Dook, et al. Yale University Press and Oxford University Press, 1939.

¹⁵ Most of the ideas of this paragraph and the next one are derived from an excellent little book, "The Impulse to Dominate" by D. W. Harding, Allen & Unwin, London, 1941.

¹⁶ See the "Impulse to Dominate" above cited; also "Domination and Integration in the Social Behaviour of Young Children" by Harold H. Anderson, Genetic Psychology Monographs, Vol. 19, No. 3, August, 1937, The Journal Press, Provincetown, Massachusetts.

¹⁷ See "The Functions of the Executive" by I. Barnard, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1940.

¹⁸ See "The Functions of the Executive" above cited.

¹⁹ Cf. "Is Germany Curable?" by Richard M. Brickner, M. D., Lippincott, Philadelphia, 1943.

²⁰ Most of the ideas of this paragraph and the two preceding paragraphs I owe to the important book, "An Essay in Metaphysics" by R. G. Collingwood, Oxford University Press, 1940.

²¹ Lack of space prevents more detailed discussion of the manner of such changes. But it will be useful to enumerate here some kinds of assumptions which the non-violent resister will be apt to encounter. These assumptions are inconsistent with those of persons considered wisest in all the great civilizations of all recorded history, and may therefore be called mistaken assumptions. Most of them are relative, but some are absolute.

Mistaken Assumptions

A. That the only practical human relationship is of dominance on one side and submission on the other.

B. That other people are a means for the purposes of those who dominate.

C. That because social order is of primary importance, the particular social order now existent is the only valuable and practical social order and therefore must be rigidly maintained. This assumption is often made also as to the existing political system.

D. That a valued end justifies the use of any means.

E. That management or ruling is the most important of all social functions.

F. That therefore managers and rulers should be rewarded by extra privileges and greater wealth of all kinds.

G. That those now in control necessarily have superior fitness to govern.

H. That those now in control are in all ways superior people.

I. That those who are physically strong, those who control the most technical knowledge, the most machines, the most materials, and the largest markets, are the ones who do survive and should survive.

J. That managers or rulers are not subject to the poison of power, nor to corruption, and are not as selfish as others.

K. That practically all other people are predominantly selfish, greedy, envious, and desirous of superior power.

L. That the weaknesses of mankind are greater than their virtues.

M. That money is the most important value.

N. That the possession of money is a sign and proof of political and social worth.

O. That production of material goods is more important than the production of healthy and normal people and of sound human relationships.

P. That certain races, nations or classes are incapable of self-government and should not be allowed even a veto power over what they are told to do.

Q. That in an organization great size is proof of its value to society.

R. That institutions are more important than people. (Note here that society is not an institution.)

S. That there is no supreme unifying principle or axiom more inclusive and more fundamental even than the principle which scientists assume underlies and unites all natural forces. Cf. Collingwood, above cited. Religions have given names to this supreme unifying principle whose existence is an absolute assumption. Some of those names are Brahma, Atman, Jehovah, God, Allah.

T. That the supreme unifying principle is not really and constantly as powerful in men's affairs as, for instance, the force of gravitation, or as the rules of chess, which control every move of the chessmen on the board.

U. That this supreme unifying principle is not immanent in all people but, if at all, only in certain select individuals including the rulers, or in certain select nations. (Such immanence would be somewhat like the immanence of the axioms in all geometrical propositions, or of the rules of a chess game in the players and the pieces used.)

CHAPTER X

1 See Alexander R. Luria, "The Nature of Human Conflict" translated from the Russian by W. Horsely Gantt, Liveright Publishing Corporation, New York, 1932; also F. Aveling, "Personality and Will," Nisbet & Co., London, 1931; Cf. also "The Psychology of Intelligence and Will" by H. G. Wyatt, Kegan Paul, London, and Harcourt, New York; and a paper on "Will and Needs" by Kurt Lewin in "A Source Book of Gestalt Psychology" above cited.

2 "Adventures of Ideas" by A. N. Whitehead, Macmillan, New York, 1933, p. 70.

3 W. W. Norton & Co., New York.

4 See "Of Men and Women" by Pearl Buck, The John Day Co., New York, 1941.

CHAPTER XI

1 "The Peace Team" by Douglas Steere.

"Discipline for World Builders" by Dan West, Brethren Service Committee, Church of the Brethren, Elgin, Ill.

"Training for the Life of the Spirit," Parts I and II, by Gerald Heard, Harpers, New York.

"Training for Peace" by Richard B. Gregg, Lippincott (out of print).

"A Discipline for Non-violence" by Richard B. Gregg, Pendle Hill, Wallingford, Pa.

"Training" by Muriel Lester, Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn.

2 Such changes will of course mean a broad programme of social reforms. There is not room here for me to offer my proposals of that sort. Yet not in institutions does initiative reside, but in persons. Before there could be socialism there had to be a Karl Marx; before there was Christianity there was Christ. Even though institutions are a powerful factor in creating certain habits of thought and certain kinds of people, institutions are not the only creative factor. Originative power lies more in people. A non-violent society can grow only from the labours of non-violent people. The development of such people seems to come first, so I limit myself here to that consideration.

3 See my "Discipline for Non-violence" above cited.

⁴ Despite the primary importance of developing the kind of people who can build a non-violent civilization, and hence the importance of a training programme, I realize that to say no more than what is in this chapter would leave most people unsatisfied, and with a sense of hanging in mid-air. They also want some idea of the tools with which adequately trained people should try to build a non-violent world. And so, since space after all permits, I very briefly indicate here some tentative recommendations for a programme of social changes.

Because socialism must result in centralization of power, and because I believe the saying that "power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely," I cannot advocate socialism as a means of building a non-violent society. And as I agree with those population experts who foresee in all the industrialized nations of the world a rapid decrease in population, I expect a correspondingly rapid decline in capitalism, large-scale technology, industrialism, and commerce. Hence my proposals do not deal directly with modern technology and its implications.

I advocate:

(1) A strong preference for agriculture as a way of life, and such emphasis on agriculture that it will become the controlling factor in the State.

(2) Simplicity of living.

(3) Decentralization and local autonomy; i.e., emphasis on the superior value of small organizations in all fields.

(4) As for integrating small units into inclusive larger units, which now is done usually by either money, violence, or political manipulation, I advocate the invention and use of modes of integration looser than and morally superior to money, violence, and competition for power.

(5) Extension of cooperatives.

(6) National, state, municipal, and rural use of Henry George's principles of "single tax". This need not be inconsistent with (4).

(7) Certain money and banking reforms.

(8) Ending of racial discrimination.

(9) Abandonment of imperialism.

(10) The development of religious practices which will really give to many people direct experience of communion with God.

(11) When, as a result, an effective plurality of society really believe in God and His effective power, then bring about a reorganization of society so that ultimate guidance of society and of governments shall rest with religious seers, who must themselves never take part in politics or hold any office but whose authority is purely moral and depends only on recognition of their actual wisdom. They

must avoid the corruption of power. The active managing and ruling groups in economic, political, educational, religious, and other spheres would be separate, but would, on questions of policy, seek the advice of the seers.

(12) The masses should be so thoroughly trained in, and understanding of, non-violent resistance that at any time they can offer an effective veto to the proposals of their rulers or to invasion by an aggressive outside group or nation.

⁵ In "The Timaeus" §48A, Trans. by R. G. Bury, Loeb ed., G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York; Heinemann, London.

INDEX

In regard to Authors, this Index includes only those who are directly quoted

- Action and thought, 47
- Agents provocateur, 77f
- Aggression, 118, 121ff
- Ahmedabad, 14
- Akali Sikhs, 14, 17-19
- Albigenses, 56
- Altruism, 50
- Andrews, C. F., xi, 6
- Andrews, Lieut.-Col. I. C., 62
- Anger, x, 16, 21, 23, 27f, 30f, 36f, 40, 42ff, 46f, 49, 51-54, 57, 78, 81, 97
- Asiatics, 5, 87
- Assumptions, 131-33
- Attila, 71
- Auto-suggestion, 30, 33, 49
- Aveling, 142
- Bardoli, 11, 54
- Barth, 107
- Baudouin, C., 33
- Begar, 10f
- Belgium, 71
- Bihar, 7
- Blake, William, 81
- Bombay City, 16f, 54
- Bombay Presidency, 11, 15f, 54
- Borsad, 14
- Boycott, 3f, 13f, 65, 73, 87, 92, 96
- Brahmans, 8-10
- Brest-Litovsk, 72
- British, 15, 17f, 59f, 97
- British Empire, 15, 71, 97
- Bryan, William J., 94
- Buddha, 20, 50
- Buddhist, 87
- Caemmerer, Lieut-General von, 36, 58, 60
- Censorship, 16, 67-69, 73
- Champaran, 7, 69
- Chauri-Chaura, 54
- China, 19, 50, 93
- Chinese, 19
- Chivalry, 26, 69, 88
- Christianity, 127
- Churchill, 115f
- Clausewitz, von, 35, 58, 60, 81, 83f
- Cleanness, 63, 69
- Coercion, x, 91
- Collectives, 109ff
- Communist, 91, 97
- Communists, 147
- Concentration of forces, 85
- Conditioned reflexes, 53
- Confession, 115
- Conflict, ixff, 22f, 35f, 42-47, 59f, 69, 72, 80-84, 86, 88ff, 95, 114, 136f
- Conflicts, 116
- Confucius, 20
- Conscience, 62f, 76
- Constructive programme, 62f, 69f
- Counter-violence, 21ff, 35f, 43ff
- Courage, 22, 25, 27, 29ff, 35, 46, 48, 52, 58, 63, 66, 69, 72, 80ff, 85, 88
- Courts, 8, 98, 101
- Coward or cowardice, 22, 30f, 78, 85
- Creative power, 29ff, 47f, 75, 81
- Criminal, 92, 97-101
- Cruelty, 27f, 117f, 130
- Curiosity, 22, 27, 66f, 92
- Deak, Francis, 3f
- Death, 44, 56, 84, 88
- Defeat, 4, 55f, 70, 72, 86

- Defence, 17, 53, 83f, 85, 89
 Desire to dominate, 125
 Dharasana, 15f
 Dictatorships, 109
 Diplomacy, 92
 Disadvantage, 23-25
 Discipline, 17, 29, 36f, 52-61, 64, 69f, 78, 80ff, 87f, 101, 133f, 138ff, 144f, 147f, 154
 Disciplines, 121, 135
 Disdain, 28, 68f, 71
 Disgust, 21, 68, 71, 74
 Dominance, 126ff
 Dominate, 128
 Domination, 149
 Drama, or dramatization, 28, 39
 East, 20, 50
 Efficiency, 32, 43, 47, 78, 80, 85, 88f
 Einstein, 147
 Energy, 23, 26, 31f, 36, 38f, 43ff, 70, 80f, 84ff, 88, 90
 Environment, 135
 Europe, or European, 5, 7, 20, 26, 83, 87, 95f
 Exploitation, 96
 Faith, 29, 46, 56, 81, 107
 Fear, x, 21f, 27f, 30f, 37, 40, 42f, 46f, 51ff, 57, 71, 77f, 81, 92, 97
 Foch, Marshal, 54, 58, 83f, 86, 90
 Follett, M. P., 41
 Fox, George, 20
 Franz Joseph, Emperor, 3f
 Frederick the Great, 60
 Freedom, 26, 91, 119f, 140
 Freudian, 33, 45
 Frustration, 120, 124, 128f
 Frustrations, 121, 126, 137
 Fuller, Col. J. F. C., 72
 Gandhi M. K., 5-12, 14ff, 20, 27, 37f, 45, 50, 54f, 66, 69, 92, 101f, 110, 116, 138, 143, 154
 Golz, von der, 58
 Goodness, 107, 109
 Government of India, 7f, 10-14, 38, 48
 Grey, Sir Edward, 129
 Growth, 112f
 Habit, 19, 54f, 59f, 76, 81ff, 93, 131, 133, 135f
 Habits, 131
 Haiti, 67
 Hardinge, Lord, 6
 Hart, Capt. B. H. Lidell, 58, 65
 Hatred, 28, 31, 36, 43, 46, 49, 51, 81, 86, 89
 Heard, Gerald, 136
 Hindu, 13, 18f
 Hocking, William Ernest, 48f, 59
 Hogben, Lancelot, 142
 Holt, E. B., 35
 Honesty, 29, 61
 Humiliation, 31, 40, 43, 66
 Hungary, 3f
 Imagination, 29, 33f, 37, 43, 75
 Imitation, 34ff, 99
 India, ix, 6-12, 14-17, 50, 54f, 64, 66f, 73
 Indian National Congress, 15ff
 Indian Nationalist Movement, ix, 15f, 48, 66, 93
 Inferiority Complex, 71, 75, 97
 Initiative, 25, 83
 Injustice, 3ff, 8, 12, 90, 95ff
 Insecurity, 126f
 Instinct, 23f, 27, 48-53
 Integrates, 130
 Integration, 41f, 86, 125, 130
 Intelligence, 41, 46, 56f, 75, 82
 Interracial conflicts, 133
 Irwin, Viceroy Lord, 66, 69
 Jail, 74, 91, 99ff
 Jains, 20, 50, 87
 Jallianwala Bagh, 64, 67
 James, William, 35, 47, 82, 90
 Jenghiz Khan, 56, 71
 Jesus Christ, 30, 50, 55
 Jiu-Jitsu, 22f, 25, 29, 31, 83
 Justice, 10, 27, 124

- Kempf, E. J., 35, 51
 Kheda, 14
 Kotgarh, 10
 Kotschau, 106
 Labour Unions, 68ff, 77
 Language, 36ff, 87
 Lao Tsu, 20, 50
 Leader, or leadership, 5, 10ff, 29, 35, 56f, 66, 101f
 League of Nations, 89, 93
 Lenin, 116, 147
 Level of conflict, 44ff
 Liberty, 119f, 145
 Lippmann, Walter, 82
 Llyod, Sir George, 87
 Loss, 28, 51, 56, 82
 Love, 29ff, 42, 46f, 88, 92, 113f, 116, 124f, 141f
 Luria, 142
 Mac Swinney, 70
 Madariaga de, 72
 Manual work, and workers, 94ff, 152f
 Martyrs, 55f, 73
 Marxians, 146f
 Maurice, Major General Sir F., 59
 Meetings, public, 5ff, 11f
 Militarist, 55, 70, 81f, 94
 Miller, Webb, 15
 Milne, A. A., 147
 Moral Power, 138f, 144
 Moral progress, 111
 Morale, 21, 58-67, 69-75, 88
 Music, 80, 152
 Nagpur, 14
 Nancy School of psychology, 33
 Napier, 142
 Napoleon, 54, 58, 83, 87
 Natal, 4ff
 Nature, 103, 113
 Nebuchadnezzar, 71
 Negroes, 56, 68
 Newton, 147
 Nicaragua, 67
 Niebuhr, Reinhold, 93
 Objects of war, 58f, 76, 82f, 85, 88f
 Officers, 60ff, 66, 72
 Order, 70, 78, 80, 82, 93, 101
 Pacifism, ix, 93f
 Patel Vallabhbhai, 12ff
 Pavlov, I. P., 53
 Peace, ix, 45, 82, 89, 93ff
 Pearson, 6
 Persistence, 22, 29, 43f, 47, 60, 63, 70, 73f
 Person, 147
 Persons, 146
 Personality, 23, 26, 80
 Persuade, 115
 Persuasion, x, 112, 115
 Plato, 155
 Police, 9, 15-19, 42, 64, 69, 77, 84
 Power, 148f
 Press, 14f, 17, 24, 67f
 Prestige, 24, 64f, 67, 69, 71f, 74, 79
 Pride, 27f, 41f, 47, 63, 67f
 Processions, 6, 17f
 Propaganda, 27, 71, 76f
 Property loss, 4, 6, 13f, 24, 56, 95
 Public opinion, 6, 9, 13f, 27f, 40, 62-72, 73f, 76-78
 Pugnacity, 48f, 52f, 78
 Punjab, 14, 19
 Quakers, 118f
 Reading, 151
 Red Cross, 17
 Reforms, 144f
 Refusal, 3, 12f, 47f, 54
 Resentment, x, 36, 43f, 86, 97
 Respect, 24, 26f, 32, 40, 63f, 69ff, 74, 81, 83, 98
 Respect for personality, 26f, 31
 Revenge, 31, 36, 43, 45, 49, 81, 86, 89, 98
 Rhythm, 105
 Rivers, W. H. R., 35, 40, 60
 Romance, 80f, 90
 Ross, E. A., 35
 Round Table Conference, 37
 Rousseau, 107
 Russel Bertrand, 147

8ff, 90
 27f, 32, 46, 52, 85
 ol, 21, 57, 88
 nment, 15, 17ff
 ct, 24, 31, 48, 64, 70, 75, 81
 ., 53, 77
 s, 39, 53, 114f, 130f, 151f
 . F., 22, 25, 28, 68
 17ff
 ditation, 153
 56, 61, 71, 73, 76f, 81f, 85
 eneral, 5, 7
 roval, 26f, 30, 40
 vice, 153
 42, 56f, 58-67, 72f, 77, 84ff,
 rica, 4, 6f, 27
 8, 105-109, 112f, 140
 23, 28, 33f, 37, 53, 75, 92,
 E., 10f
 x, 36, 83, 86, 88
 14, 24, 27, 44, 59, 65, 72
 ousness, 32-39, 99
 on, 39, 45f, 85
 22, 26, 34, 39, 60, 65f, 73, 75,
 22ff
 1, 25f, 30, 32f, 35, 37, 60, 69
 n of feelings or of impulses,
 , 33, 38, 41, 45, 47, 80, 89
 15, 22, 25, 27, 32, 42, 60,
 5, 17ff
 , 28, 34, 42, 65f, 73f

Tolstoi, 20
 Training, 135-140, 144, 149ff
 Transvaal, 5f
 Travancore, 8
 Trotsky, 94, 147
 Trotter, W., 27, 49
 Trust, 37, 42, 90, 97, 110
 Truth, 29, 45, 50, 61f, 68f, 72, 76f,
 80ff, 86, 88, 92f, 115f, 126, 133
 United States, 59, 64, 67f, 71, 77,
 93, 95, 97
 Unity, 28, 34, 47f, 50, 57, 59, 66,
 73ff, 80, 88, 92
 Untouchables, 9f
 Values, 21f, 24, 29, 31f, 48, 77, 86
 Victory, 43, 54, 58, 76, 83, 85ff
 Voluntary suffering, 21f 26, 34, 73,
 75, 88
 Vykom, 8f
 Wallas, Graham, 41
 War, 60f, 149, 154
 Wellington, Duke of, 54, 61f
 West or Western, ix, 50f, 55, 59,
 67, 87, 93, 96
 White, William A., 44
 Whitehead, A. N., 142
 Whitman, Walt, 114
 Will, 33, 49, 59, 66, 75, 85f, 142
 Willingdon, Viceroy Lord, 69
 Wilson, President Woodrow, 94
 Women, 6, 13, 17ff, 88, 90
 Wonder, 22, 25, 27f, 32, 42, 68f, 92
 World War, 27, 50, 58, 67, 70, 76f, 94

